A CASE ANALYSIS OF TWO MAJOR AMERICAN REFORM PROPOSALS: A NATION AT RISK AND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDIES

By

RHEA ZIRKES SCHWARTZBERG

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1988

To my husband Leo
and to my children
Hanan, Dina, and Shira
who gave so much love and understanding

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest appreciation and gratitude are extended to my committee chairman, Dr. Paul George, who gave me his continued encouragement and guidance. To him I express my sincere respect and admiration.

I am also grateful for the support of the members of my committee and for their encouraging conversations and constructive suggestions: Dr. Stephen Fain, Dr. Gordon Lawrence, Dr. Forrest Parkay, and Dr. Arthur White. To Dr. Fain, who has been my advisor and mentor since I began my master's program, I give special thanks.

Special thanks also go to my brother Dr. Melvin Zirkes for his continuous emotional support and encouragement and to my in-laws, Mildred and David Schwartzberg, who lived through this project in a very personal way.

Finally, this work is dedicated to my husband Leo, and to my children Hanan, Dina, and Shira. Leo, my engineer, whose love, support, and expertise in child-raising made the completion of this degree possible. The love, patience, and support of Hanan, Dina, and Shira provided the motivation needed for the completion of this study. I will be forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. iii

ABSTRACT. vi

CHAPTERS

I INTRODUCTION. 1

Statement of the Problem. 1
Significance of the Problem 2
Research Questions. 9
Assumptions and Limitations 11
Definition of Terms 13
The Design of the Study 18
Summary 26

II REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF TEN. 29

Organization of the Committee of Ten. 29
The Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies 32
Major Social Forces and Motivational Factors. . . . 36
Reaction to the Committee of Ten Report 53
Summary 64

III A NATION AT RISK: THE IMPERATIVE FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM. 66

Organization of the National Commission on Excellence in Education 66
A Nation at Risk: The Report. 72
Major Social Forces and Motivational Factors. . . . 84
Reaction to A Nation At Risk. 98
Summary 121

IV COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDIES WITH A NATION AT RISK. 123

Similarities and Differences Between the Reports in Terms of American Values in Periods of Changing Economic Milieus. 123
Similarities and Differences in Responses to the Reports 144
Similarities and Differences Between the Reports in Light of the Curriculum Theories of Zirbes and Miel. 152
Summary 154

V CONCLUSIONS 156

Continuity of Curricular Change 156
Redirection of Educational Institutions During Periods of Economic Transformation. 159
Implications for Future Curriculum Development and Reform. 162

REFERENCES. 172

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 192

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

A CASE ANALYSIS OF TWO MAJOR AMERICAN REFORM PROPOSALS: A NATION AT RISK AND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDIES

By

Rhea Zirkes Schwartzberg

April 1988

Chairman: Dr. Paul S. George
Major Department: Educational Leadership

Two major American reform proposals were compared and contrasted in a case study analysis. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, the 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education and the Committee of Ten's Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, written in 1892 were examined. The formation and composition of the committees, their objectives and goals, and possible economic, social, and political motivations, as well as the content of the proposals and responses to the reports were compared and contrasted.

The purpose of the study was to examine elements of change and continuity within A Nation at Risk and the report of the Committee of Ten, in order to better understand the process of curriculum development and reform in the United States. The objective was to consider whether

the proposals reflect changing goals and values over the century, or whether there are common underlying themes, goals, and objectives. The similarities and differences between the reports were discussed in light of two models of curriculum change and development.

The 16 elements of continuity in the committees' recommendations were identified as reflecting a return in each era to a traditional, conservative type of curriculum. Each committee was seen as playing an important role in the redirection of American educational institutions during periods of economic transformation. Both reports accepted the college-bound student as the normative student, recommended tighter graduation requirements, increased standards and expectations for student achievement, improved methods of evaluation, improved teacher training programs, and increased articulation between secondary school graduation requirements and college admission policies. Both committees accepted the beneficience of schools as institutions which prepare students to take their places in society through a common curriculum. The similarities and differences were further considered in relation to a "spiral curriculum" theory of curriculum development.

The importance of analyzing the history of curriculum development in order to better plan for the future was stressed. Implications were suggested for future curriculum reform efforts in the United States as a whole, and for Florida in particular.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The question that was examined is to what degree do selected American educational reform proposals reflect elements of both change and continuity? A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE,1983) was investigated in depth and compared and contrasted with The Committee of Ten´s Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies (NEA, 1892/1969). The researcher analyzed the degree to which the two reports are similar in terms of the responses to the reports by educators and the media. The purpose was to analyze these two reform proposals for elements of change and continuity to understand better the process of curriculum reform in the United States.

The objective was to ascertain whether the work of the NCEE and the Committee of Ten reflected changing goals and values over the century, or whether there were common underlying themes, goals, and objectives. The researcher explored the economic, political, and social concerns of the educational and lay leadership of the NCEE and used

historical sources to analyze the same concerns of the Committee of Ten. The researcher sought to analyze the degree to which the reports reflected a redirection of educational institutions and curriculum development in the United States during periods of national economic transformation.

Significance of the Problem

In the early 1980s lay and educational publications have been replete with reform proposals, including those of the Twentieth Century Fund (1983), Boyer's report for the Carnegie Foundation (1983), and Mortimer Adler's Paideia Proposal (1982). None has received the attention, on both educational and political fronts, as the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), titled A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983). Written as an open letter to the American people, A Nation At Risk thrust education into the national limelight. The issue of curricular reform became the center of social, economic, and political debates and a major media event from the spring of 1983 to today.

Chris Pipho (1984a) reported that over 280 state task forces were convened in the 12-month period following the issuance of the NCEE report. Terrel Bell credited the report as being the prime cause of major changes in Republican

educational policies during the Reagan administration (Bell, 1986). Many states' leaders enacted what may be far reaching educational reforms. In its passage of the RAISE Bill, the 1984 Florida legislature followed the recommendations of the NCEE in raising the educational standards and expectations of parents, teachers, staff, and students. The length of the school day was increased, requirements were stiffened, and stricter homework and attendance policies were delineated (Turlington, 1986; United States Department of Education, 1984).

In May 1984, President Reagan proclaimed 1984-85 the "Year of Excellence in Education." In 1985, Turlington, Florida Commissioner of Education, issued a report, "Getting Ready for 1989", in which he outlined objectives designed to help move Florida schools into the upper quartile for educational achievement in the United States. Noting that over 100 changes had already been initiated since the State Board of Education committed itself to making Florida a "State of Educational Distinction," Turlington stressed the positive effects which improved educational institutions would have on all aspects of life in Florida. For the Florida of Florida to fully benefit from the current wave of reform efforts initiated by the publication of A Nation At Risk, educational history must be analyzed to understand how similar major curriculum reform proposals,

such as the report of the Committee of Ten, have been received in the past.

There are several theories which have been delineated by educational historians to explain the role of schools in American society: According to one theory education is viewed as the humanitarian brainchild of leaders who wish to facilitate the educational and social mobility of the students. According to another, the public school movement is seen as part of a broader reform effort which led to the Sunday school movement, utopian communal experiments, and the adult lyceum movement (Cremin, 1961). Ravitch (1985) in her "social conflict theory" proposed that shifts in the values of American society precipitate major institutions to realign themselves with various educational reform movements in order to secure their own goals. Revisionist historians reject the humanitarian theory of curriculum change, perceiving that the values and attitudes which make up the American school system are products of changing economic and social developments. Karier, Spring, and Violas (1973) stated that schools which exist today under capitalism, communism, and fascism exist as instruments of social and political power for certain elite groups of the society. "The educational state that emerged . . . did so as an in-instrument of the economic and political elites who managed the corporate estate" (p.6).

Freire (1970) saw educational institutions as being instruments for the maintenance of the dominant culture. Katz (1971), Spring (1973), Callahan (1962), Curti (1966), and Itzkoff (1969) accepted that schools have been molded by conservative lay and educational leaders to further capitalistic interests which benefit the business community. Carnoy (1974) accepted the Marxian thesis that changes in the means of production result in significant changes in the social institutions of a society. He viewed school leaders as trying to legitimatize themselves by promising individual and societal liberation through material, moral, and social mobility.

In the past 30 years many traditional historians, who view schools as humanitarian institutions aimed at helping students prepare to take their part in society, have qualified the humanitarian role of the educational change agents. Bailyn (1960) viewed education as a force which helps students maximize their potential. Yet, he noted that the changing heterogeneous society of the New World caused education to become an instrument, "by which dominant groups sought to recreate an ideal unity and minorities struggled to retain their group's identity" (p.7). Gay (1980) also understood the primary function of educational institutions to be the preservation of the majority culture. Recently some educational historians have begun to reject both the

traditional humanitarian and revisionist social control theories of curriculum development and have postulated a practical revisionist theory. All groups have their hidden agendas, but according to the practical revisionists educational history has been controlled by people in power dealing in each era with practical questions of convenience.

Further research is needed to understand the process of American educational reform proposals: whether they reflect changing educational goals and values; whether there is something consistent in the major reforms of the past century; and whether curriculum development has been motivated by humanitarian leaders, social control engineers, or both. Both conservative and radical educational historians agree on the importance of analyzing the past in order to better plan for the future: Katz (1971) believed that by the late 19th century the basic principles of American education were in place, creating a tax supported, free, compulsory, class biased, bureaucratic institution. A leading revisionist, Katz stressed that real educational changes are impossible to consider without first analyzing the roots of current problems. He noted that the purpose of education, and what schools can and can not do has not changed in over 100 years; that real change is unlikely in contemporary society without contemplating educational history.

Cremin (1961) believed that many of the educational problems from the turn of the century have come back to plague contemporary educators, including the relationship among America's social, political, and economic institutions. He viewed modern reformers as continuing to repeat the mistakes of the earlier Progressive period, while insisting on the novelty and uniqueness of their reforms. Cremin noted that educators need to consider how educational history repeats itself in order to properly understand contemporary reform movements. Yudof (1984) stressed the need for educational reformers to examine and develop their theories of education before considering the practical ramifications of their proposals. "Conceptualization logically precedes the reform of practice" (Yudof, 1984, p.459). Reitzel and Lindemann (1982) noted the important role which historical analyses play in helping generalize from the past to the present.

The purpose in this case study was to analyze whether there are similarities between the NCEE report and that of Committee of Ten and the degree to which an understanding of the similarities and differences between the reports can be furthered by a study of associated social concerns. Analyzing the similarities and differences between the reports is important for curriculum development in general, as a means of learning from the past and being able to better plan for the future.

Such an analysis is critical in Florida, one of the fastest growing states in the nation, where educational institutions must continue to reevaluate their goals and objectives to attract industry and what Naisbitt referred to as the technological, informational "sunrise economy" (Naisbitt, 1982, p. 71).

Educational change agents need to consider past efforts, both successful and unsuccessful, when proposing reform measures. "The overarching answer to `why?´ is the need to be in command of a field rather than to be a puppet responding to the whims of those within or outside the field" (Miel, 1968, p. 159).

Ratner explained in his introduction to Dewey´s Education Today (1969) that education played a central role in Dewey´s concept of democracy. To Dewey (1969), democracy facilitated the intellectual and moral character of the people--elements necessary to encourage progress and reform in American society (p.v). Dewey believed in the importance of examining society´s givens, understanding what the major forces at work are, and then developing educational objectives and goals to meet those forces. This researcher accepted Dewey´s philosophy and intended to demonstrate that an analysis of the major social economic forces in the 1880s and 1890s can help educators and laypeople understand the motivational influences behind A Nation at Risk and

Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies and the impact of these reports on education.

Research Questions

Three major research questions were pursued:

1. To what extent are the NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten similar in terms of American values in periods of changing economic milieus?

2. To what degree are the NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten similar in terms of the responses to the reports by educators, the media, state legislatures, and other related groups?

3. To what extent can differences and similarities between the NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten be understood in light of the models of curriculum change and development described by Zirbes (1935/1968) and Miel (1968)?

Seven supporting questions (see p.22) were used as multiple embedded units of analysis of the three major research questions (Yin, 1984). These supporting questions were focused on the formation of the committees; their composition, goals, possible motivations, and conclusions; and how the reports were received following their publication.

Laura Zirbes (1935/1968) separated educational reforms into two main categories--traditional versus progressive.

Movement to a traditional curriculum from a progressive period included emphasis on the content values of the curriculum; learning skills; curriculum based on subject matter; dictated, prescribed and controlled learning environments; an emphasis on scheduling and organization; texts and workbooks; mass teaching; subject matter skills; question and answer recitation; and a subject matter orientation. The present researcher examined the extent to which traditional and progressive elements are present in the recommendations of the NCEE and the Committee of Ten reports.

Alice Miel (1968) argued that it is erroneous to see the inclusion of such traditional proposals as a negation of everything progressive. She was interested in analyzing the history of curriculum to find patterns which might assist curriculum specialists in planning for the future. Based on her research she noted that educators seemed to move from one area of curriculum concern to another. In any period, the educational community would absorb itself with one movement, fad, or problem and then move on to another concern. "It is not new for people in our profession to attempt to redress a balance by compensating for an underemphasis or correcting an ensuing overemphasis" (Miel, 1968, p.9).

In looking for a pattern of curriculum development, Miel (1968) rejected the concept of an either-or curriculum pattern, where new replaces old, as old patterns are rejected and replaced by new innovations. She also rejected the swinging pendulum theory of curiculum development, that educational reforms swing back and forth as if on a pendulum locked in set grooves. Instead, Miel supported the concept of a "spiral curriculum":

> In common with the pendulum swing, this view allows for renewed attention to a problem and line of solution which have been negated for a time. The difference in the spiral view is that it accounts for the fact that proposals made at a later point in educational history usually are much more refined, with wisdom distilled from experience at both sides of the spiral built into them. (p.156)

The Committee of Ten report and A Nation At Risk were analyzed by this researcher in light of the models of curriculum described by Zirbes (1935/1968) and Miel (1968).

Assumptions and Limitations

1. It was assumed that A Nation at Risk and the Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies are major American reform proposals.

2. It was assumed that a historical analysis of the reports will aid the educational reform effort throughout the United States in general and specifically in Florida.

3. It was assumed that public pronouncements and published reports reveal the intent of authors.

4. It was assumed that primary and secondary sources written over a period of over 90 years will allow for an analysis of the workings of the Committee of Ten and its report.

5. It was assumed that an analysis of A Nation At Risk is possible despite the brief passage of time since its publication.

6. It was assumed that cultural anachronisms, subjective perceptions and values of the researcher, and secondary sources can still allow for objective, significant comparisons of the major reform proposals.

7. It was assumed that there is a connection between educational reforms and economic transformations in society.

Limitations involved in historical studies have been discussed by Berelson (1952), Block (1971), Gottschalk (1969), Holsti (1969), Krippendorff (1980), and Shafer (1980). Despite these limitations, it is believed that this study will make a contribution to the field of education by providing a comparative analysis of primary and secondary sources written by major professional and lay commentators. Such an analysis may yield valuable information concerning the goals and objectives of the writers of the reform proposals.

Definition of Terms

Change and continuity. Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary (1975) defined change as "any variation or alteration in form, state, quality or essence" (p.302). For the purpose of this study the definition of The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (1976) where change is defined as, "making or becoming different; substitution of one for another" (p.165) was preferred. This definition does not imply a judgment of the change on the basis of the quality of the change. Miles (1964) defined educational innovations as being "deliberate, novel, specific change which is thought to be more efficacious in accomplishing system goals" (p.647). Reform proposals are designed to produce changes. The intent in this study was not to describe the positive or negative effects of the changes, but rather to describe the reform proposals.

Change is presented in this study as the antithesis of continuity. Webster (1975) defined continuity as "a continuous series or succession; unbroken, coherent whole" (p.395). The purpose of this dissertation was to analyze A Nation At Risk by comparing it to the Committee of Ten Report, to consider whether it reflects elements of both change and continuity. Value judgments concerning the two terms are not relevant in and of themselves, though the

appropriateness of continuous educational policies in light of changing economic realities will be explored.

Cuban (1979) stressed the importance of studying how internal and external forces have contributed to the stability of curriculum development. He defined three stages of educational change. The first level is the conception and discussion of the idea, practice, or program. The implementation and carry through represent the second stage. The third stage is reached when the concept is integrated into all levels of the curriculum and is repeatedly evaluated.

Goals and objectives. Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis (1981) explained that whereas the terms "goals" and "objectives" both refer to desired outcomes of the curriculum, there is a difference in their connotative meanings. " `General goals´ mean . . . the achievement toward which effort is directed . . . significant outcomes desired from an educational program. . . . Objectives state the specific, overt changes in student behavior that are expected to result from participation in a unit of learning activities" (pp.162-163). The two reform proposals and other primary and secondary sources were analyzed to consider the dominant curricular goals and objectives, as well as the motivations of the reform committee members.

Major reform proposals. The major reform proposals chosen for analysis in this study were picked based on their acceptance by educational historians as critical documents which have had, and continue to have, significant effects on curriculum innovations in American educational history. Educational historians such as Cremin (1961) have pointed to the Committee of Ten's work as being of prime importance in the movements towards universal secondary education, standardization of schooling, and Progressivism. Since the spring of 1983 the report of the NCEE has produced more furor in both professional and lay educational circles than any other event since Sputnik (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983).

Major social, political, and economic forces. The periods of major social, political, and economic forces examined in this study are those agreed upon by popular economic, political, and social theorists as resulting in significant transformations in the quality of life in the United States (Cuban, 1979). Toffler (1980) described the two first major waves of change as the agricultural revolution and the rise of industrial civilization. His theory that America is in the process of undergoing a transformation to a highly technological, anti-industrial society (the "Third Wave"), makes a historical analysis of the NCEE and the Committee of Ten especially important. Naisbitt (1982) also described the major social, economic,

and political transformations that have occurred as the United States has moved from an agricultural, to an industrial, to an information based society and the effects which the transformations have had on education.

Primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are the basic materials of historical research representing first-hand evidence of an event or experience (Good, Barr, & Scates, 1941; Van Dalen, 1962; Wiersma, 1969). Good (1963) defined primary sources as "the original documents or remains, the first witnesses to the event, with only the mind of the observer or eye witness coming between the original event and user of the source" (p.194). The fewer the people who intervene between a happening and the recording of the event, and the more immediate the event, the more likely it is that the event will be reported accurately (Fox, 1969).

Van Dalen (1962) defined secondary sources as "summaries of information written by a person who did not directly observe the event, object, or condition" (p. 162). Such sources are accounts "at least once removed from an event" (Wiersma, 1969, p.290). In the social sciences Forcese and Richer (1973) defined secondary sources as referring to "preexisting or prerecorded data which were not collected for the specific ends of a given social researcher" (p.179). Fox (1969) explained that secondary information can range in immediacy from sources who were

close to the original event, to sources written many generations later. The benefit of utilizing secondary sources in research is that they provide a synthesis of many primary sources for the reader. The problem lies in the bias, inaccuracies, and subjectivity which often contaminate secondary information (Borg & Gall, 1971; Forcese & Richer, 1973). However, Danzger (1982) investigated the reliability of newspaper reports and concluded that they were not as inaccurate and subjective as people assumed.

Good, Barr, and Scates (1941) and Van Dalen (1962) emphasized the difficulty in labeling a source primary or secondary, since reports often contain both firsthand and secondhand information. The reliability and validity of sources are determined through internal and external criticism (Good, Barr, & Scates, 1941; Van Dalen, 1962; Wiersma, 1969). The external criticism determines the authenticity of the source. The internal criticism validates the credibility of the information. Whether a source is considered primary or secondary is often determined by the problem under consideration (Good, 1963).

Utilized in the study were both primary and secondary sources. The reports of the two committees, as well as writings by the committee members and assorted government documents were the primary documents consulted. In analyzing reactions to the reports following their publications both

primary and secondary sources were consulted including media reports, governmental legislation, and books and articles written by committee members. The usefulness of newspapers, government files, and reports as primary sources was reported by Reitzel and Lindemann (1982).

Spiral curriculum. Alice Miel (1968) viewed the repetitiveness of educational history and educational reforms as occuring in a spiral manner, rather than as dichotomous, unrelated educational events. Her theory of the existence of a spiral curriculum enables historians to analyze, compare, and contrast current and past educational reform efforts and to theorize as to the future state of education in America.

The Design Of The Study

Case study methodology was used to analyze A Nation At Risk. "A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (Yin, 1984, p.23). The case study "is a way of organizing social data so as to preserve the unitary character of the object being studied" (Goode & Hatt, 1952, p.331). Yin suggested using the case study method when

asking how and why questions and when the investigator has little or no control over the events being studied (Yin, 1984). The strength of the case study method for social science research has been documented by many authors (Eckstein, 1975; George, 1979, Leenders & Erskine, 1973).

The goal of the investigator according to Reitzel and Lindemann (1982) and Yin (1984) is to expand and generalize on theories that are presented. In this study two major American reform proposals were analyzed via the curriculum development models of Zirbes and Miel. The objective was to analyze the degree to which the reports reflect a redirection of educational institutions and curriculum development during periods of national economic transformations. It was hoped that conclusions from the case study would afford a greater understanding of curriculum development as a whole and reform efforts in the State of Florida in particular.

The case study method lends itself to problems where analytic generalizations of theories, as opposed to statistical generalizations, are desired (Yin, 1984). The method is often used to illuminate how and why decisions are made, how they are implemented, and what effects the decisions have (Yin, 1984; Leenders & Erskine, 1973). The design is thus conducive for an analysis of elements of

change and continuity within the curriculum reform movement via the theories of Mile (1968) and Zirbes (1935/1968).

Yin delineated several components necessary for the implementation of an exploratory case study research design: Study questions are posed, asking who, what, where, and especially how and why. Probable sources of evidence are delineated and can come from six sources: documents, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observations, and physical artifacts. The study's propositions--the purpose of the research and what is to be examined within the scope of the study--are determined. The unit of analysis is then specified, and an analysis of the data begins only after the theoretical basis for the research is detailed (Yin, 1984). An exploratory case study such as this can be divided into five major steps: problem definition, design of the study, data collection, data analysis, composition, and reporting of the findings. Theories play an essential role in the research model, for they provide the logic for linking the data to the propositions of the research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Yin, 1984). In this case study, the curriculum development theories of Zirbes and Miel were used to interpret the comparisons and contrasts found between the NCEE and the Committee of Ten reports.

The strengths of the case study model have been well documented and its weaknesses addressed (Campbell, 1975; Edgar & Billingsley, 1974; Forcese & Richer, 1973; Yin et al., 1983). Many suggestions have been offered to improve the construct, internal, and external validity of the method. Yin recommended that, whenever possible, previous literature and case studies should be used to further define the case under consideration (1984). He stressed that the analysis gains greater internal validity as the multiple embedded subunits within the case are analyzed via multiple sources of evidence. Yin referred to this type of case study as a "multiple comparative case design with multiple embedded units of analysis" (pp.52-53). The validity of generalizing from single and multiple case studies has been well documented (Campbell, 1975; George, 1979; Kennedy, 1979; Yin, 1984).

In this case study of curriculum development, three major research questions guided the identification of the subunits to be investigated. The three major questions were (a) to what extent are the NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten similar in terms of American values in periods of changing economic milieus; (b) to what degree are the responses to the reports by educators, the media, state legislatures, and other related groups similar; (c) to what extent can differences and similarities between the

NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten be understood in light of the models of curriculum change and development described by Zirbes (1935/1968) and Miel (1968)? The focus was on the extent to which the reports reflect both change and continuity of curricular philosophy.

The primary and secondary sources that were examined include the reports themselves, as well as contemporary professional analyses in major educational journals. The following supporting questions were used as multiple embedded units of analysis (Yin, 1984) to gain insight into the three major research questions stated above.

1. What motivational factors may have influenced the formation of the commitee?
2. Who were the participants on the committee?
3. What were the stated goals of the committee?
4. What major conclusions were reached?
5. What were the major social, political, and economic forces in American society at the time the report was issued?
6. How was the report received by political leaders, educational leaders, and the media?
7. What effect did the report have on the development of educational policies for the schools?

These supporting questions were used to assist in comparing and contrasting the reports, their social milieus,

and the reactions to them. Reitzel and Lindemann (1982) noted that, "an increased understanding of the external content often modifies initial interpretations of a document, and a close analysis of the document contributes to an understanding of its historical context" (p.183). The objective was to examine whether the reports reflect attempts by educational conservatives to impose order on educational institutions during periods of national economic transformations; and to consider whether the similarities and differences between the reports, understood in light of the change models proposed by Miel (1968) and Zirbes (1935/1968) have implications for curriculum development in general and for educational institutions in Florida in specific.

The literature reviewed can be broken into five areas: research methodology, history of education, philosophy of curiculum development, literature related to the report of the Committee of Ten, and the NCEE report. The search of the literature provided the author with an in-depth understanding of the five areas and established that an intense case study of these two major reform proposals has not been done before.

In the area of methodology major research texts were consulted including but not limited to those by Berelson, 1952; Block, 1971; Campbell, 1975; Danzger, 1982; Eckstein,

1975; Edgar and Billingsley, 1974; Forcese and Richer, 1973; George, 1979; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Good and Hatt, 1952; Gottschalk, 1969; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; Leenders and Erskine, 1973; Reitzel and Lindemann, 1982; Shafer, 1980; Yin, 1981a, 1981b, 1984; and Yin et al., 1983.

In the area of history of education the major authors consulted included but were not limited to Bailyn, 1960; Callahan, 1962; Cremin, 1961, 1977; Cuban, 1979; Curti, 1966; Freire, 1970; Gay, 1980; Itzkoff, 1969; Karier et al., 1973; Katz, 1971; Krug, 1965; and Ravitch, 1983, 1984, and 1985; and Spring, 1973. Sources consulted for the history and philosophies of curriculum development included but were not limited to, Dewey, 1956, 1966, 1969; Miel, 1968; Miles, 1964; Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis, 1981; and Zirbes, 1935/1968.

The older, mostly primary sources and reprints related to the Committee of Ten included many works written by committee members as well as their contemporaries American Philological Association, 1894; Baker, 1894; Commissioner of Education, 1893; Eliot, 1869a, 1869b, 1885, 1892, 1905, 1911, 1967, 1969a, 1969b, 1970, 1971; Hall, 1905; Harris, 1884, 1885, 1888, 1891, 1894, 1869a, 1869b; Mackenzie, 1894; NEA, 1892/1969; Neilson, 1926; Robinson, 1894; Schurman, 1894; and Taylor, 1894.

Other sources consulted for information on the Committee of Ten included, but were not limited to, Bellack, 1969; Brubacher, 1966; Cochran, 1972; Cohen, 1974, Curti, 1966; Doyle, 1976; Dunkel, 1973; Good, 1962; Graves, 1970; Hogan, 1978; Hunkins, 1976; Kantor, 1982; Krug, 1964a, 1964b, 1965; Meyer, 1967; Mulhern, 1959; Perkinson, 1977; Thayer, 1974; Tyack, 1967; and Welter, 1971.

Over 90 primary and secondary sources related to A Nation at Risk were cited in this study. Legislative reactions were cited and discussed by many including, but not limited to Bondi and Wiles, 1986; Bridgeman, 1985; Education Commission of the States, 1984; Graham, 1984; Mollison, 1984; Pipho, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1985a, 1985b, 1986a, 1986b, 1986c; and United States Department of Education, 1984. Articles and books written by six members of the NCEE were consulted including Augier and Gordon, 1973; Campbell, 1981, 1984; Giamatti, 1966, 1983; Gordon, 1968, 1983a, 1983b; Holton, 1970, 1978, 1984; Holton and Elkana, 1982; Holton and Morrison, 1978; Hyde, Perlman, and Seaborg, 1971; Katz, Seaborg, and Morse, 1986; Marsh and Campbell, 1982; Seaborg, 1963, 1981; and Seaborg and Corliss, 1971. The reform proposals of Adler (1982) and Goodlad (1983) were also consulted.

Reactions to the NCEE report were researched through newspaper, journal and magazine articles, and speeches,

educators: Adelson, 1985; Albrecht, 1984; Albrecht and Duea, 1983; American Association of School Administrators, 1983; Antonalli, 1984; Atkin, 1985; Bell, 1983, 1984, 1986; Best, 1984; Block, 1983; Boyer, 1984; Breckenridge, 1984; Brown, 1986; Cardenas and First, 1985; Chandler, 1983; Clark, Astuto, and Rooney, 1983; Clement, 1983; Cleveland, 1986; Deal, 1985; Dominick, 1984; Doyle, 1976; Doyle and Hartle, 1985a, 1985b; Duke, 1985; Education Commission of the States, 1984; Fernandez, 1985; Finn, 1984, 1985a, 1985b, 1986a, 1986b; Geske and Hoke, 1985; Goodman, 1984; Graham, 1984; Gross and Gross, 1985; Hacker, 1984; Hawkins, 1985; Hawley, 1985; Honig, 1984; Howe, 1983, 1984; James and Tyack, 1983; Lauderdale, 1987; Lewis, 1984; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, 1985; Odden, 1984; Passow, 1984; Peterson, 1983, 1985; Presseisen, 1986; Ravitch, 1983, 1984, 1985; Reagan, 1984; Sarason, 1983; Shanker, 1984a, 1984b, 1985; Spock, 1984; Spring, 1984; Stedman and Smith, 1983; Symposium, 1984; Timpane, 1984; Toch, 1984; Trow, 1985; Turlington, 1985, 1986; Tye, 1984; Walberg, 1986; Welsh, 1986; Wimpelberg and Ginsburg, 1985; Winn, 1983; and Yeakey and Johnston, 1985.

Summary

This researcher analyzed A Nation At Risk (NCEE, 1983) and the Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies

(NEA, 1892/1969) via the three major research questions and seven supporting analytical questions discussed in the Design of the Study section above. The researcher used the report of the Committee of Ten to explore the extent to which the report of the NCEE contains elements of change and continuity--continuity of American social, political, and educational values in periods of changing economic milieus. The degree to which the two reports are similar in terms of responses to the reports by educators and the media was explored. The researcher sought to examine to what extent the differences and similarities between the reports can be understood in light of the curriculum development models described by Miel (1968) and Zirbes (1935/1968). The implications for curriculum development in general, and in the State of Florida in particular, were discussed.

Chapter I has included an analysis of the problem and its significance and an explanation of the design of the study. Chapter II includes an in depth analysis of the Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies (NEA, 1892/1969). Chapter III contains an examination of A Nation At Risk (NCEE, 1983). Chapters II and III contain an analysis of the formation of the committees, including their composition, goals, possible motivations, conclusions, and reactions to the reports following their publication.

In Chapter IV the researcher compares and contrasts the reform proposals via the three major research questions and the seven supporting analytical questions, used as multiple embedded units of analysis (Yin, 1984). A summary of the findings and an analysis of what implications can be drawn for the future of education as a whole and in Florida in particular are included in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF TEN

Organization of the Committee of Ten

The Committee of Ten was appointed at a National Education Association (NEA) conference held on July 9, 1892, by the National Council of Education, a subunit of the NEA. The Committee was approved officially by the Board of Directors of the NEA on July 12, 1892, and given a budget of $2,500, then a considerable amount of money (Krug, 1965). The 10 leaders were charged with arranging conferences for the major subject areas of the curriculum in order to discuss needed reforms in secondary school programs. The Committee of Ten was comprised of

Charles Eliot--President of Harvard (Chairman)
William Harris--U.S. Commissioner of Education
James Angell--President of the University of Michigan
John Tetlow--Headmaster of the Girls High School (Boston)
James Taylor--President of Vassar
Oscar Robinson--Principal of The High School (Albany)
James Baker--President of the University of Colorado
Richard Jesse--President of the University of Missouri
James Mackenzie--Headmaster of Lawrenceville School (NJ)
Henry King--Professor of Oberlin College (Ohio)

Secondary schools in the United States were surveyed to consider which subjects were being taught and for how many hours a week. Only 40 out of 200 schools contacted responded to the survey. Nine subcommittees were then formed in November, including Latin; Greek; Math; English; Other Modern Languages; Physical Science; Natural History (Biology, Botany, Zoology, Physiology); History, Civil Government, and Political Economy; and Geography (Physical Geography, Geology, and Meteorology). Of these, only the areas of Math, Greek, and Latin had previously been considered college preparatory courses (Krug, 1964a).

The Committee of Ten chose 10 regular members and 2 to 4 substitutes for each of the nine subcommittees, trying for a geographical balance, as well as for a balance between college and secondary school members. However, the Committee of Ten later reported that the, "distribution of the membership was slightly impaired" (NEA, 1892/1969, p.6) by the unwillingness of some of the members contacted to serve on the committees. The report does not list who turned the committee down, though it does mention that two scholars who agreed to participate never showed up to the committee meetings. Only 70 of the 90 regular members originally selected, agreed to serve. Twelve of the 20 substitutes chosen, were chosen by the Committee of Ten. By

November 11, 1892, the subcommittees were selected. Forty-seven of the subcommittee members were from colleges or universities, 42 were from secondary schools, and 1 was a government official. Butts (1955) noted that few of the members of the committees were active teachers in the school system. Many educational historians have pointed to the predominance of college professionals in the group, interested in college as well as common school concerns (Brubacher, 1966; Doyle, 1976).

Eleven questions were selected as guides for the various subject area discussions:

1. At what age should a subject first be introduced?
2. How much time should be spent on a subject throughout a child's entire education?
3. How much time should be devoted to the subject in the secondary school?
4. What topics should be covered within the subject area?
5. Which of these subjects should be covered in the secondary school?
6. What types of college requirements should be developed based on the designated subject area?
7. Should there be a difference in how the subject is taught to students who plan to go on to college?
8. If yes, then at what age should the differentiation begin?

9. What are the best teaching methods for the subject area?
10. What methods should be used to test knowledge of the subject matter as part of college admissions requirements
11. Should there be preliminary and/or final college entrance exams in the subject area?

The Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies

The Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies issued in 1893 (referred to below as the report) was written by Eliot and Tetlow. It included reports of conferences held on December 28-30, 1892, summarizing conclusions of the subcommittees which met on November 9-11, 1892. Unanimous conclusions were reached by most committees, and many of the recommendations were consistent across the subject areas (NEA, 1892/1969). James Baker prepared his own document, but when he failed to win the support of other educators at the November 1893 meeting of the NEA, he elected to attach his statement as a minority report to the report of the Committee of Ten (see below).

The first part of the report contained a discussion of the history of the organization and the work of the individual committees. Four tables were included. Tables I and II in the report illustrated the recommendations of the individual committees concerning the scope and importance of the subject areas. The fourth table was the compromise

model curriculum designed by the Committee of Ten, based on the recommendations of the individual committees (Harris, 1894).

Most committee members believed that their areas should be introduced to the students at an earlier age, with the scope of the material increased in the later years of schooling. By so doing, the younger students could learn the fundamentals of the discipline, so that when it was reintroduced in greater depth in the secondary schools and colleges, the students would already have a basis from which to draw their advanced knowledge. The educators believed that the subject areas should not be studied in isolation and that comprehension of one area would aid in knowledge of others. It was thus recommended that teachers try to interrelate the subject areas that they were teaching.

It was unanimously agreed that children going on to college, the minority of the students in the secondary schools, should not receive a differentiated education. If more highly trained teachers would succeed in standardizing the curriculum in the secondary schools, the quality of the education for all students would be improved. The report writers were also unanimous in their desire to have teachers of the lower classes raise the level of scholarship within their schools and their expectations regarding the capabilites of their students. The educators noted that all

students in all schools had the right to the same quality education, taught by qualified instructors.

The report writers endorsed the principle of "equivalence of studies" (Mulhern, 1959, p.515) in order to meet societal and individual needs. "The suggestions of the Conferences presuppose that all the pupils of like maturity in any subject study it in the same way and to the same extent, so long as they study it at all--this being a point on which all the Conferences insist strongly" (NEA, 1892/1969, p.38). The concept was that all disciplines could be studied for the same period of time and be of equal value (Mulhern, 1959).

The main function of the schools was not to prepare students for their continuing education since most children did not go on to college, but to prepare them "for the duties of life" (Mulhern, 1959, p.51). However, since students are not always certain when they begin their secondary education whether they will be continuing on to college, the revamping of the curriculum would insure that any student graduating from a secondary school program would be eligible for admission to college. The nation as a whole would thus benefit from a closer articulation between the colleges and the secondary schools, as the less rigorous, often useless courses were eliminated from the schools' curriculum. The Committee succeeded in reducing the diversity of

courses in the secondary schools as students were encouraged to study fewer subjects in greater depth.

The Committee of Ten admitted that it would not be possible for all of their recommendations to be carried out in all schools throughout the United States. Many committee members expressed their concern at being able to find sufficiently skilled teachers in some areas to carry out the recommendations. Better trained teachers and improved training programs were needed. It was recommended that teachers be paid to attend school during the summer. Better use could be made of universities, superintendents, and master teachers. All would work at helping to improve their local schools (NEA, 1892/1969).

Regarding the problem of articulation, the Committee suggested that the colleges make their admission standards more flexible to automatically admit students who had followed the Committee of Ten´s recommended curriculum. Secondary schools were then encouraged to limit their curriculum to the nine recommended subareas discussed by the Committee (Perkinson, 1977). The general report outlined four curricula called Classical, Modern Language, Latin-Scientific, and English. The Classical Course included more modern areas than had previously been accepted and the English Course incorporated a foreign language requirement.

All four suggested curricula required the inclusion of English, mathematics, and history.

Major Social Forces and Motivational Factors

Charles Eliot, William Harris, and James Angell are recognized as being the most influential members of the Committee of Ten (Brubacher 1966; Curti, 1966; Good, 1970; Krug, 1965; Perkinson, 1977; Welter, 1971). The three educational leaders, as well as other Committee of Ten members, have left a wealth of primary sources which have been used by educational historians to help explain the motivations and philosophies of the Committee of Ten.

Charles Eliot--Chairman of the Committee of Ten

Charles Eliot, a leading educator, was instrumental in facilitating reforms in secondary education to meet changes occurring in the fields of industry, science, and politics (Krug, 1964a; Ravitch, 1985). Eliot was a prolific writer and orator during his 16 years as President of Harvard and his 17 years as President Emeritus, 16 of which he served as editor of the Harvard Classics. His educational philosophies can easily be assessed from the voluminous primary sources which are still in circulation. Neilson (1926) alone edited a 2-volume compilation of Eliot's speeches and articles that were approved by Eliot for posthumous publication.

In February and March of 1869 Eliot published in the Atlantic Monthly, what came to be known as his "New Education" articles, which helped "earmark" him as an educational reformer (Krug, 1964b). In them, he explained that he was not opposed to classical education, but that he sought to validate scientific and technical courses in the secondary schools. Eliot argued that students in a modern society needed to choose from modern curricular electives in deciding on their high school courses of study (Eliot, 1869a). Elected President of Harvard 2 months after the publication of the articles, Eliot vigorously defended, in his inaugural address, his strengthening of the elective system at the university (Eliot, 1869b). Eliot often explained his hope that reforms of college curricula would ultimately lead to reforms in all levels of education, since "schools follow universities, and will be what universities make them" (Eliot, 1885, p.1556).

At Harvard, Eliot distinguished himself by facilitating major reforms in the law and medical schools and by creating the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in 1872. Under his tuteledge Harvard grew from a faculty of 60 with an endowment of $2 million to a faculty of 600 with an endowment of $20 million (Perkinson, 1977).

An admirer of the philosophies of Jefferson and Mann, Eliot stressed that an educated citizenry was critical for

strengthening a democratic society in transition (Krug, 1965). He hoped to use the schools to increase the social and economic mobility of all students and their families. A follower of Emerson, Eliot valued individuality and hoped to adopt his curricular recommendations to meet the needs of the students (Eliot, 1892; Krug, 1965).

At the NEA meeting in 1892 Eliot delivered what was to become one of his most famous addresses, "Can School Programs be Shortened and Enriched" (Eliot, 1892). He questioned whether it was possible for secondary school programs to be enriched in content and shortened in terms of the number of courses required. Eliot noted that graduates entering Harvard were older then they had been and hoped that by reforming the secondary schools, students "might embark sooner on the task of earning their living" (cited in Brubacher, 1966, p.379). Although schools had originally sought to prepare students for life, by the early 1890s educators became increasingly concerned with preparing students for college. Due to the lack of uniformity in secondary school programs, completion of high school was viewed as an insufficient and unreliable index of being prepared for admission to college.

The popularity of secondary schools increased from 1860 until 1895 (Perkinson, 1977). In 1860 there were only 40 public high schools. By 1900 there were 6,000 (Dunkel,

1973, p.233). The expansion in the number of high schools was seen as positive, but the proliferation of subjects that resulted led to a lack of uniformity. College leaders uncertain which graduates merited admission, longed for a uniform system of secondary education.

After the Civil War, members of the University of Michigan faculty visited high schools throughout their state to determine which schools' curricula were acceptable to allow for admission to the university without entrance examinations. James Angell, President of the University of Michigan, and Charles Eliot, President of Harvard, were instrumental in seeking the creation of an NEA committee which would help standardize secondary programs to facilitate college admissions. Eliot reported on this problem again at the NEA meeting in 1890. At that time the delegates blamed the colleges for their diversified requirements. It was agreed that greater articulation between the secondary programs and the colleges was needed (Perkinson, 1977).

At the July 12th session of the NEA convention Charles Eliot delivered a talk on "Undesirable and Desirable Uniformity in the Schools" (Perkinson, 1977). He was faced with the problem that his affinity for a system of curricular electives was well known, as was the desire of the NEA to create a uniform curriculum in the secondary

schools. Having been appointed the chairman of the Committee of Ten 3 days earlier, Eliot felt the need to clarify his position on uniformity in the schools, before the committees began to meet (Krug, 1965).

The Harvard president rejected creating a single set curriculum within a school which would result in undesirable uniformity and be unresponsive to the needs of individual students. Eliot hoped that secondary school leaders would adopt an elective system similar to the one which had been instituted at Harvard. The desirable uniformity would result within a given subject, so that anyone studying the subject would study the same material in the same manner for the same amount of time.

Eliot explained, in the Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, that the NEA looked to the Committee of Ten to develop a new blueprint for the high schools which the members believed needed to be reformed. The NEA leadership expressed their hope that standardization of requirements for graduation, curricular content, and scheduling would improve the quality of both the secondary schools and institutions for higher learning. Before the report, a classical course of studies in a secondary school consisted of 2 to 3 years of Greek and 4 years of Latin, intended to assist the student in preparing for his college entrance examinations. Students who chose the English

course of studies were seen as opting for a terminal curriculum. Such a choice precluded many students from later changing their mind and applying to college. Eliot hoped to strengthen the English track so that it would also be acceptable for college admission (Krug, 1964b).

Changing Social Forces in the 1890s

The importance of education to people in the final decades of the 19th century has been explained as resulting from a series of political, social, and economic factors relating to the wage labor system (Callahan, 1962; Cremin, 1961; Cuban, 1979; Curti, 1966; Handlin, 1971; Hogan, 1978; Katz, 1971; Krug, 1964b; Spring, 1972; and Tyack, 1974). These included the decrease in the amount of available land; the question of how to educate the recently emancipated blacks; the harsh realities of child labor and sweatshops; the growing monopolies in the world of industry that were destroying small businesses; and increased economic competition with other countries, coupled with dramatic advances in transportation and industrialization. The cultural traditions of the working class groups in the major cities valued education, since achieving upward mobility and economic success was seen as being tied to receiving a good education.

Cochran (1972) noted that the Committee of Ten was formed under pressure from the business community to develop

a more utilitarian form of secondary education. He explained that in the late 1800s changes occurred in the relationship between educational leaders and the business community. Earlier in the century the business community had sought to educate students to take what was perceived to be their proper places in society. The education of the masses was thus desirable, but only up to a point. By the early 1890s, Cochran saw educational leaders as attempting to move away from the interests and needs of big business. For a short period school leaders again reemphasized the legitimacy of classical and traditional curricula. College leaders, under strong church leadership, exercised a strong influence on education in this era where schools were supported directly by the taxpayers, and most school age children were from rural areas.

Cochran noted that the situation soon began to change again, especially in major cities, as the white collar middle-class began to grow. Until the 1890s, curriculum construction was carried out by individuals or by single agencies. By the end of the century the popularity of education committees in general, and the NEA committees in particular, increased and educational decision-making began to take on a more centralized form (Hunkins, 1976; Krug, 1964a). Schools as we now know them became more popular throughout the country (Cuban, 1979). By 1893, the Committee

of Ten, with its strong college leadership, was under pressure from the business community. In addition, educational leaders themselves began to search for reforms as a necessary response to the chaos in the cities that was resulting from increased industrialization and urbanization. Cochran stressed that throughout the late 19th century the leaders of the NEA pictured the schools as a conservative social force. The primary goal was the creation of a patriotic citizenry that was opposed to radicalism and willing to take their place in the new society, without giving up old values and ideals. He saw the Committee of Ten as reinforcing the traditional curriculum, while adding and legitimatizing many new subjects such as drawing, bookeeping, and commercial math (Cochran, 1972).

Ravitch (1985) explained that the NEA was concerned with cooperating with the business community in helping prepare students for the occupational requirements of the new industrialized society. Handlin (1971) and Kamin (1974) discussed the emphasis placed on testing in the schools during this period as a means of facilitating the creation of a cheap labor force, while controlling the influx of uneducated Eastern European immigrants.

Kantor (1892) noted that, for most of the 19th century, schools did not prepare students for specific occupations. Starting in the 1880s, lay leaders along with educators

began to criticize the schools for ignoring the realities of a world undergoing industrialization. Kantor explained that, between 1880 and 1920, the United States changed from a decentralized, regionally-oriented economy of small workshops and farms to a national network of urban, industrial corporations. The increased mechanization resulted in a greater need for semiskilled workers, supervisors, and managers as factories replaced workshops and the scale of production expanded. As the apprenticship system became outmoded, pressures were placed on the NEA to prepare the students for their new roles in society by increasing the availability of vocational education programs. Thus, the Committee of Ten appears to have been responding to the critics of the new society and the business leaders, while attempting to maintain the values of the old educational order.

Doyle (1976), Katz (1971), and Krug (1964b) also stressed the influence of immigration, urbanization, immigration, and industrialization on curriculum reform during this period. According to a report published by the Commissioner of Education in 1893, the statistics available for 1889-1890 showed that only 14.4% of the 202,963 public high school students and 27.7% of the 94,931 private students were planning on going on to college (Commissioner of Education, 1893). Yet, from 1872 to 1900 the number of

graduate students in universities increased from 198 to 6,000 (Dunkel, 1973, p. 233).

William T. Harris--Commissioner of Education

Nicholas Murray Butler once said that an educator could not possibly comprehend the history of American education without understanding the life and work of William T. Harris, 1835-1909 (cited in Thayer, 1974, p.160). Harris was the Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis at age 33, and later served as the first United States Commissioner of Education from 1888 through 1906. The excellence of the St. Louis schools attracted national attention. Harris became known for analyzing educational problems philosophically and psychologically and providing great insight into recommended teaching methodologies (Graves, 1970). During the course of his lifetime, Harris delivered over 175 addresses at NEA conventions, many dealing with questions concerning the functions of the schools themselves (Meyer, 1967). Perkinson (1977) noted that no educator of the period did more to implement the philosophy of liberal reform than Harris.

Harris, an ardent capitalist, played an important role in a society undergoing the transition from an agricultural and rural orientation to an industrial and urban culture (Curti, 1966; Good, 1962). Opposed to radical social reform, Harris believed that education assists in molding a

child´s personality and reasoning through verification and demonstration methodologies. With proper guidance the child is transformed from a savage to a civilized, moral member of the community and society (Harris, 1888, 1891). Schools existed, according to Harris, for the purpose of reinforcing the goals of the "four fundamental institutions of civilization" (Harris, 1894, p.585): family, society, the state, and the church.

Harris understood that he was living in an age of transition. He believed that immigrants should be aided in maintaining their cultural heritage, yet he also believed that the uneducated immigrant was responsible for the rampant corruption in society. Harris therefore viewed education as not only critical to meet the new technological needs of industry, but also to help keep the United States strong and prevent it from becoming a haven for undesirable, uneducated immigrants (Curti, 1966).

Insight represented to Harris the highest level of thinking, whereby the student is prepared to consciously participate in society. As an admired educational philosopher, Harris helped people adjust to the importance and costs of public education in the modern society, while helping them hold on to their old values (Welter, 1971). He believed that people must not passively adjust and adapt to society, but that mankind had the obligation to

learn to deal actively and creatively with the environment without rebelling (Hunkins, 1976; Thayer, 1974). The traditional curriculum would help preserve liberty and prevent chaos (Welter, 1971). Harris (1884) explained

> this age is often called the age of productive industry . . . . Emancipation . . . effected by machinery . . . . There is one general training especially needed to prepare the generations of men who are able to act as directors of machinery, and managers of the business that depends on it--this training is in the habits of punctuality and regularity. (p.1911)

Harris' belief in the superiority of reason over nature resulted in his supporting humanistic education as opposed to a vocational and practical curriculum. At this time, many educators, including Eliot, supported the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, who believed in the importance of science and practical subjects over aesthetics. Harris believed in the importance of traditional subjects but was willing to accept the minimal inclusion of some modern utilitarian subjects in the curriculum (Curti, 1966). A realist, he did not oppose the sciences, accepting that students needed to learn more science for the good of the business community (Good, 1962). A proper education would allow students to have an advantage in the "international competition for markets" (Harris, 1885, p.315). Harris praised the business community for its support of education and the schools for providing capable workers for the industries (Curti, 1966).

Harris developed and stressed the importance of the "five windows of the soul which open out upon five great divisions of life" (Harris, 1969a, p.321). The five windows included reading, writing, art, and literature; math and physics; geography and biology; history and political science; and grammar, language, logic, and philosophy. He noted that elementary and secondary programs would increase a student's cultural awareness and that vocational preparation should not formally occur until college. When Harris was later forced by the realities of political and social changes to accept the inclusion of vocational education within the secondary school curriculum, he still insisted that the history and philosophy of the trades be taught along with the practical elements (Thayer, 1974).

Cremin (1971), Cuban (1979), Kliebard (1975), and Ravitch (1985) noted that Harris helped bureaucratize schooling in the United States by developing the "rational model of curriculum making" (Ravitch, 1985, p.180). In this model educators make decisions concerning what teachers should teach, teachers teach the materials using texts, and then test the students to check whether the curriculum has been learned. Opposed to faddish reforms, Harris favored heterogeneous graded classes in which the teacher utilized class recitation exercises, as opposed to individualized instruction. He repeatedly stressed the need for high quality teachers in both secondary schools and

colleges who could help students to read critically, and not just memorize facts. Superior college teachers were needed who would help train superior teachers to work in the schools (Cohen, 1974). In the elementary and secondary schools, excellent teachers would help the students accept their cultural heritage. In the colleges, the teachers would be responsible for training the students in how to evaluate and synthesize their life experiences (Curti, 1966).

Other Prominent Educators From the Committee of Ten

The importance of improving the education of teachers and administrators was a lifetime concern of James Angell. Angell pushed for the creation of a department at the University of Michigan to assist in the "Art and Science of Teaching" (Good, 1962). The goal was to strenghten the ties between the secondary schools and the colleges. Other institutions, including Columbia, soon followed suit. In a report to the University of Michigan Board of Regents written in 1874, Angell stressed the need for educators to take education courses to provide themselves with theories and philosophies with which to augment their practical on the job training (Angell, 1970).

Angell, as a college president, agreed with many of Eliot's arguments for educational reform. However, Angell believed that students who earned any high school

certificate should automatically be eligible for college admission. Eliot wanted greater uniformity in the secondary school curriculae, but believed that only students who attended schools with recommended programs would be elligible for college admission (Krug, 1965). If students chose electives, then the programs had to be based on approved areas. Angell saw a direct and positive relationship between the business community and the public schools, a relationship which he sought to encourage (Curti, 1966).

James Baker was another prominent educational leader in the fight to create uniform college entrance requirements (Krug, 1965). However, whereas Eliot advocated a system of electives, Baker argued for one uniform curriculum for all students in all schools (Baker, 1894). Baker attached a dissenting report to the Committee of Ten report, criticizing the conclusions of the educators as being too narrow in their outlook (Good, 1962).

Oscar Robinson was a high school principal who believed that the college leadership of the NEA committee was too theoretical. He objected to many of Eliot's views, based on what he saw as his practical experiences as a secondary school administrator (Robinson, 1894). In several letters to Eliot (Robinson, 1894), Robinson explained that the curriculum in his school was based on the needs of his

noncollege bound students, and the available equipment and supplies. To him, the realities of the school dictated certain curricular priorities which would preclude all subject areas being given equal emphasis within the curriculum. Robinson objected also to the omission of modern subjects such as music and drawing from the recommended courses of study.

Eliot responded that it was the intent of the report to outline the ideal secondary school curriculum (Robinson, 1894). The chairman understood that specific schools would need to modify the recommendations of the report, but he criticized principals such as Robinson for designing curricula which did not adequately challenge the secondary school students. Robinson disagreed with Eliot's assessment (Robinson, 1894). The principal insisted that the students were being sufficiently motivated, and that in fact many were already being overworked by the existing curriculum. Robinson complained that stipulating additional requirements and more intense programs of study would place an undue burden, especially on the noncollege bound student. Robinson applauded the work of the committees for bringing before professionals and the lay public critical educational issues, but he objected to the theoretical nature of the final report.

James Mackenzie lauded the Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies as representing the most comprehensive working theory of secondary education ever proposed (Mackenzie, 1894). In order to carry out the recommendations of the Committee of Ten, Mackenzie believed that 4-year secondary school programs should be extended to begin 2 years earlier and end 2 years later.

John Tetlow suppported Eliot's desire to include more modern subject areas in the curriculum, but he disagreed with the chairman as to how many electives the students should be permitted to take. Tetlow worked closely with Eliot in revising several drafts of the committee's report and later worked vigorously for the recognition of the more modern subject areas by the colleges, through the New England Association (Krug, 1965).

James Taylor, President of Vassar, strongly supported the final committee report and complemented Eliot for not letting his personal opinions "color" the document (Taylor, 1894). In describing the underlying principles accepted by the Committee of Ten, Taylor stressed the need for a sequential curriculum, quality instruction and curricular content, and the need to provide a basic education in all secondary schools so that students who did not continue their education after high school would still be prepared for life in the American society (Taylor, 1894).

Reaction to the Committee of Ten Report

Thirty thousand free copies of the Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies were distributed by the United States Office of Education to educational leaders throughout the country. Responding to public demand for the report, the American Book Company reprinted the report in 1894, adding an index (Krug, 1964a).

Harris presented the report to the public for the first time in his address on secondary school curricula before the Department of Superintendence in Richmond during February 1894. A large portion of his speech was devoted to describing the workings of the Committee of Ten and the subsequent report. Harris noted that the report represented a compromise document based on compromises reached by the individual committees, as synthesized by the Committee of Ten (Harris, 1894). Krug noted (1964a, 1965) that the conference participants spent 2 days critically debating the report, and that the debate continued in professional journals and association meetings for over a year. Educators writing in The American Journal of Education, and Butler's Education Review defended the report, while for the most part articles in Education and The Journal of Education opposed it.

Harris later stated that the curriculum recommended by the Committe of Ten served as a blueprint for high schools

for many years (Perkinson, 1977). However, the recommendations of the Committee of Ten report met with disagreement from several factions. James Baker formally presented the report a second time, at a meeting of the National Council of the NEA (Krug, 1964b). Baker presented 22 points for the report and 7 points against (Baker, 1894). In the heated discussion which followed, Robinson joined Stanley Hall (see below) in criticism of the report, whereas James Mackenzie, another member of the Committee of Ten, defended it (Krug, 1965).

There are several characteristics of the report that fueled the controversy: the emphasis placed on foreign languages including classical Latin; the increased importance which the Committee of Ten assigned to the natural sciences; the preponderance of college educators from the northeast that served on the various committees; and the lack of provisions that were made for physical education, fine arts, business, and vocational subjects. Eliot, himself, was disappointed at the exclusion of these subjects (Krug, 1965). He viewed the four curricula described in the report as merely models and approved their inclusion in the report only because of the greater stress that was placed on modern subjects. Some educators objected to the Committee of Ten's conclusions because the educators wished to maintain the classical distinction between terminal curricula for

noncollege bound students and college preparatory programs. Supporters of increased local control of the schools opposed the centralization tendencies of the report (West, 1980). Many were concerned that the recommended reforms would lead to the domination of the high schools by the colleges (Tyack, 1967).

An interesting analysis of the report was provided by Schurman in the School Review. Schurman (1894) criticized the organization of Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies. He noted that the reports of the nine conferences were placed in an appendix totaling 190 pages, whereas the final synthesis by the Committee of Ten totaled only 59 pages. Schurman further argued that by each committee working alone to further its own subject area, when the reports are examined together a whole is generated which is impossible to achieve. Typical secondary school programs contained 20 periods. Putting all of the recommendations of the conferences together would result in 9th graders having 25 periods; 10th and 12th graders 33 periods, and 11th graders 34 periods. Schurman suggested that the recommendations of the conferences be reexamined to determine what portion of the curriculum should be assigned to specific subject areas.

Some of the strongest organized criticism of the report came in 1894, when the American Philological Association created a Committee of Twelve to fight to ensure a dominant

role for classical Greek and Latin subjects within the high school curriculum (American Philological Association, 1894). Krug noted (1965) that the attacks by the conservative groups on the Committee of Ten in the mid-1890s are fascinating in light of the fact that by the turn of the century the report was criticized for being too conservative a document. At the 1896 NEA convention, the conservative factions succeeded in passing a resolution to restore five periods a week of Latin in the recommended high school curriculum. Ravitch explained (1985), that the liberal reforms of the Committee of Ten were rejected by the Progressives who called for narrower curriculum options, out of a desire to differentiate between college bound and vocational students. Oddly, the desire of both groups was to prepare the students for their roles in society.

Doyle (1976) explained that the Committee of Ten attempted cautious reforms in a desire to make the schools more accessible to middle-class children, while also modifying the curriculum to meet the needs of the 20th century. He explained that the conservative college orientation of the Committee of Ten must be understood in light of the elitist, middle-class orientation of the school leadership at the end of the 19th century.

Tyack (1967) believed that the Committee of Ten tried to achieve meaningful reforms and noted that later

educational historians may have judged Eliot as a traditionalist because the radical reforms of Eliot's era became the stereotypic conservative policies of the next Progressive period. Krug (1964a) and Ravitch (1985) stressed that as a result of the controversies that it engendered, the Committee of Ten was often understood to have advocated the exact reverse of what it intended.

Ravitch (1985) explained that the academic orientation of the Committee of Ten's report conflicted with the emerging philosophy of professional educators at the turn of the century. She explained that the Progressive movement resulted from the frustrations of the younger educators with what they perceived to be the traditional, conservative curriculum advocated by the Committee of Ten. The influx of immigrants required the school leadership to facilitate the assimilation of the students into American society. Many educators believed that a differentiated curriculum and more vocational courses could best meet the needs of the immigrant children. Ravitch noted that, instead, the Committee of Ten recommended a common curriculum, out of the belief that such a curriculum would provide the greatest opportunity for the most students. Good noted (1962) that despite the conservative label that was placed on the report by many critics, it was Eliot's picture which was chosen for the cover of the first issue of Progressive Education.

Eliot served as honorary president and a consultant to the Progressive Educational Association from its inception in 1918 until his death.

Although not adopted at the time, some of the recommendations of the Committee of Ten influenced later reform efforts: The committee's articulation philosophy, seen at the time to be too radical and liberal in nature, has been said to have influenced curriculum reform proposals for over half a century (Brubacher, 1966). Good (1962) noted, however, that despite the attention that the report received, most educators continued to differentiate between college bound and noncollege bound students.

The Committee of Ten had hoped that the curriculum in all high schools would become uniform, so that graduating from any high school would automatically entitle a student to be admitted to college. This articulation philosophy was not adopted, but it influenced the 1895 NEA--appointed Committee on College Entrance Requirements and helped lead ultimately to the creation of the College Entrance Examination Board in 1900. The Committee on College Entrance Requirements endorsed the major conclusions of the Committee of Ten and recommended that a system of standardized units or credits be instituted in the schools. They hoped that a system of electives would help replace the set curricula in the secondary schools. The Carnegie

Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching further defined the "unit" as being a course of five periods taught throughout the academic year. The Eight Year Study (1932-1940) built on the Committee of Ten's articulation philosophy by persuading college leaders to accept students coming from progressive secondary schools who did not meet the normal entrance requirements. The Eight Year Study authors suggested, as had the Committee of Ten, that graduating from a secondary school should be a sufficient prerequisite for admission to college (Brubacher, 1966).

Many historians, including Krug (1964b), Meyer (1967), and Tyack (1967) noted that the liberal reforms recommended by Eliot and the Committee of Ten helped create a climate favorable to educational change and helped in shaping the American high school at the turn of the century. The opposition of the Committee of Ten to the use of rote memorization had an important effect on teaching methodologies used in classrooms in the north (Ravitch, 1985). The debate brought the issue of the importance of curriculum development before mass numbers of educators for the first time (Doyle, 1976). The report helped set the precedent that curriculum decisions were best made by committees of experts (Hunkins, 1976). Superintendents used the report to legitimatize reforms. One superintendent referred to the report as, "the cloud by day and the pillar

of fire by night that is to lead us into the promised land" (Tyack, 1967, p.358). The recommendations of the Committee of Ten that the entire educational experience be restructured to included 6 years of elementary education and 6 years of secondary education went largely ignored at the time. The proposal, however, provided theoretical legitimatization for later policies.

Stanley Hall, a leader of the Child Study Movement in America, was the major opponent of the Committee of Ten´s report. In "Stanley Hall´s Criticism of the Committee of Ten" (1905) he explained that he saw three fallacies in the report: Many teachers and administrators did not feel ownership of the changes since the reforms were being implemented from "the top down," from the colleges and universities down to the high schools. Hall conceded that many improvements had resulted from the report, but noted that the changes did not take into account individual differences among the students. He argued that the Committee of Ten did not make provisions for the "incapables" (p.1947) and explained that he objected to teaching all students the same materials in the same manner, no matter what their capabilities or career choice "destinations" (p.1949).

Secondly, Hall objected to the concept that all subjects are of equal value if taught equally well. The doctrine of formal discipline, which he believed the

Committee of Ten supported, stated that a subject either had intrinsic value separate from the learner or that the learner could grow intellectually by merely interacting with the subject area (Thayer, 1974). Hall saw some subjects as being more important than others.

Finally, Hall objected to the Committee of Ten´s philosophy that preparing a child for college was the same as preparing the student for life. Instead, Hall advocated cultivating a child´s individual interests to help prepare him for his "destination" in life. Hall suggested that the committee´s report was biased by the college educators who desired reforms which would benefit their college recruitment programs.

Eliot responded to Hall in an essay, "The Fundamental Assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten" (1905). In this essay, presented originally at the 1905 meeting of the American Institute of Instruction, he noted that American educators expected less from students then their European counterparts. Eliot agreed that there should be curricular choices for students with specific problems, but insisted that capable children needed to be adequately challenged. He explained that the individual conferences agreed unanimously that teachers should teach a subject the same way to each student, but that this did not mean that all students had to study the same subjects for the same

amounts of time. He clarified that the Committee believed that each subject had a best method of instruction which should be used in all classes, that each subject had specific content matter that should be mastered within a suggested time frame, and that mastery of the specified subjects was seen as beneficial to the student. Eliot agreed that individual instruction was important, but stressed that principals needed to address the needs of the classes, not the individuals.

> Some amount of standardizing, quantifying, calibrating, or schematizing . . . is absolutely indispensable in every school . . . . The uniformity should apply to the method of teaching and to the selection of the fundamental topics in each subject . . . but not to the selection of the subjects by the individual pupil, or to the length of time that the individual pupil pursues each subject. (Eliot, 1905, cited in Good, 1962, p.1952)

Eliot further insisted, as he had first argued in an 1892 address to an NEA convention, that there were few "incapables" in the schools, and that holding back capable children was more of an injustice than hurrying the incapable. He hoped for a curriculum constructed to give opportunities for learning to as many students as possible and noted that in a democracy it was critical for students to delay their career choices for as long as possible. He denied that the Committee of Ten had a college-oriented bias and noted that, in fact, some of the responding committees addressed their recommendations specifically to the students who would not be going to college. Eliot´s rebuttal of

Hall´s arguments is accepted as representing the end of the major debates concerning the report of the Committee of Ten (Krug, 1965). Krug noted that by the turn of the century, the majority of the educators sided with Hall and viewed the report as a propaganda document engineered by the college leaders.

Eliot noted that the educators who participated in the Committee of Ten report were concerned with providing all students with a well rounded education and improving schools for all children, whether they intended to go to college or just remain in school for 6 years. The assumption was that if the high school courses were worthwhile they would prepare the students for life as well as for a college education. Eliot further explained that the dogma that all subjects are of equal educational value if taught equally well, is not explicitly stated in the committee report. Some critics were erroneously implying this from the willingness of several of the subcommittees to provide curricular choices for the students (Eliot, 1905).

Some educational historians such as Thayer (1974) viewed the Committee of Ten report as authoritatively supporting the doctrine of formal discipline (see above). He noted that only one member of the committee, James H. Baker, challenged the assumption that studying the approved

curriculum would prepare a student for college and that the electives could be interchangeable.

Bellack (1969) quoted the noted educational historian Sizer as having referred to the report of the Committe of Ten as being "the first such effective document in the history of education" (p.287). Bellack believed that social and cultural changes that occurred in the United States at the turn of the century rendered the Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies obsolete by 1910.

Summary

The Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies reflects a redirection of educational institutions during a period of national economic transformation. At a time when society was changing from an agricultural to an industrialized model, the NEA, a major educational organization, charged a special committee with the task of reforming secondary schools. Given an extremely large budget for that period, the Committee of Ten was asked to analyze each subject area and by so doing, to reevaluate the very purpose of the secondary schools. The objective was to create order and uniformity out of chaos--both in the schools and in society as a whole.

The conservative orientation of the NEA, the Committee of Ten report, and the leading educators who participated in

the debate over the report has been documented. It is clear that the function of the Committee of Ten was not to suggest the implementation of radical reforms, but rather to help modernize the curriculum and bring it more in line with changing social, economic, and political forces. The synthesis achieved by Eliot and his committee legitimized some modern subject areas, while supporting the concept of a basic curriculum for all students. The concern of the committee that the schools serve to socialize the immigrant and prepare the student to take a productive part in the new American society has been shown.

Chapter II has included an analysis of the motivational factors which influenced the formation of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, including relevant social, political, and economic forces. A description of the committee's composition, its goals, and conclusions has been provided, along with a summary of the major conclusions of the report and an analysis of how the report was received by educational leaders.

CHAPTER III

A NATION AT RISK: THE IMPERATIVE FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Organization of the National Commission on Excellence in Education

The National Commission on Excellence in Education was created by Terrel Bell, United States Secretary of Education, on August 26, 1981. Bell, an appointee of President Ronald Reagan, charged the Commission to investigate the quality of education in the United States and issue a report detailing its findings by April of 1983. On April 26, 1983, David Pierpont Gardner, chairman of the commission, issued the final report entitled A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (NCEE, 1983).

The Charter of the NCEE was created by Secretary Bell on August 5, 1981. In it, Bell granted the commission its authority under 20 U.S.C. 1233a and stipulated that the NCEE was to be governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92-463;5 U.S.C. Appendix I) and by the General Education Provisions Act (P.L. 90-247 as amended; 20 U.S.C. 1233 et seq.). The Charter of the NCEE included eight main objectives (NCEE, 1983, pp.39-40):

1. The Commission was charged with evaluating the educational process in public and private schools, as well as institutions of higher learning. The emphasis of its examination was to be on teenage high school students.

2. The members were asked to compare the curriculum, standards, and expectations in those schools with educational institutions in other countries.

3. The achievement of the high school students was to be compared with college admissions data, to see how college admissions requirements influenced the standards in the high schools.

4. Exemplary programs which facilitated student success on college entrance examinations and achievement in universities were to be highlighted.

5. The relationship between changing social and educational forces over the past 25 years and student achievement was to be assessed.

6. Hearings were to be held to gather suggestions for reforms.

7. Problems were to be delineated which needed to be addressed in order for educational excellence to be achieved in the schools.

8. Practical recommendations for the implementation of the educational reforms were to be reported.

In a cover letter to Secretary Bell included with the report, Gardner explained that the main objective of the Commission was to "define the problems afflicting American education" (p.iii) and to clarify the strengths and weaknesses of the system, without treating "subordinate matters in any detail" (p.iii).

The Charter of the NCEE further described the structure of the Commission and provided guidelines as to how often and under what conditions the group was to meet. Commission members were awarded an honorarium of $100 per day, as well as reimbursement for other stipulated expenses. Bell estimated that excluding support staff, the annual cost for operating the Commission would be $332,000. An additional $453,000 was allocated for the support staff, excluding support and research work that would be undertaken by the National Institute of Education. Details of the supporting reports, which were expected, were described and August 1983 was set as the termination date for the commission's work (NCEE 1983).

The NCEE was ultimately comprised of 18 members, 13 men and 5 women, of which 15 were educators and 3 were from the private sector. The 15 educators on the commission included 6 with college affiliations, 2 principals and 1 teacher from the high school sector, and 6 educators affiliated with educational associations. The 3 lay leaders included 2

persons from the business sector, of which 1 was a parent and 1 person from the political sector (Holton, 1984). The members of the Commission were as follows

David P. Gardner--President, University of Utah
President-Elect, University of California (Chairman)

Yvonne W. Larsen--Immediate Past-President, San Diego City School Board (Vice-Chair)

William O. Baker--Chairman of the Board, Bell Telephone Laboratories (Retired)

Anne Campbell--Former Commissioner of Education, State of Nebraska

Emeral A. Crosby--Principal, Northern High School (Detroit)

Charles A. Foster, Jr.--Immediate Past-President, Foundation for Teaching Economics

Norman C. Francis--President, Xavier University of Louisiana

A. Bartlett Giamatti--President, Yale University

Shirley Gordon--President, Highline Community College (Washington)

Robert V. Haderlein--Immediate Past-President, National School Boards Association

Gerald Holton--Mallinckrodt Professor of Physics and Professor of Science, Harvard

Annette Y. Kirk--Kirk Associates, Mecosta, Michigan

Margaret Marston--Member, Virginia Board of Education

Albert H. Quie--Former Governor, State of Minnesota

Francisco D. Sanchez Jr.--Superintendent of Schools, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Glenn T. Seaborg--University Professor of Chemistry and Nobel Lauereate, University of California, Berkeley

Jay Sommer--National Teacher of the Year, 1981-1982,
New Rochelle High School, New York

Gardner, in his introduction to the report, stressed that the Commission was politically nonpartisan (p.iii). President Reagan (1984) described the NCEE as "a bipartisan panel of the nations most eminent educators, representing all elements of the education community." (p.14). Ravitch (1985) agreed, but Chandler (1983) and others have noted that there was only one teacher on the NCEE. Gerald Holton (1984), a member of the NCEE, explained that initially he saw the composition of the Commission as being problematic, failing to adequately represent the educational organizations. Holton worried that the Commission would alienate professional organizations, opening itself to attack by the educators. Certain that a consensus would be impossible given the diversity of the members, Holton and others only accepted their appointments to the Commission, given Bell's assurance that minority reports could be issued. Minority reports were not needed in the end, as the 18 members reached complete agreement on the final report.

In gathering data over an 18-month period, the members of the NCEE commissioned 41 papers by experts and examined existing analyses of educational issues (NCEE, 1983). Opinions and recommendations were solicited from students, parents, educational and lay leaders, and other American citizens in a series of meetings organized by the 10

regional offices of the Department of Education. Testimony was heard, as well, at eight meetings of the entire Commission, two panel discussions, a symposium, and six public hearings. Individual commission members also participated in a public hearing on rural education at the University of Kentucky. In response to a request by the NCEE, over 200 educational organizations provided detailed information on over 300 programs which the organizations considered to be notable in nature.

Seven of the eight full commission meetings were held in Washington, D.C. Of the 17 scheduled public commission events, 12 were held on the eastern seaboard of the United States and 11 were hosted by universities (NCEE, 1983). Chandler faulted the Commission for not taking into account regional differences among school systems and for not scheduling hearings in more diverse locations (see below). Letters and reports were solicited from educators and citizens from around the country concerning educational problems and possible solutions. Appendix D of the NCEE report lists over 220 hearing and testimony participants, as well as the site visits to schools and training facilities and lunch and dinner meetings which took place (NCEE, 1983). The seven specific areas of discussion throughout the 18 months were science, math and technology education, language and literacy, skills for academic learning, teaching and higher

education, college admissions and the transition to post-secondary education, education for a productive role in a productive society, and education for the gifted and talented.

Florida was part of Region IV, in which a Public Meeting on Excellence in Education was held on October 22, 1982, with Ted Freeman as the regional representative. Testimony was given by several Floridians on May 12, 1982 at a public hearing on "Teaching and Teacher Education" held at Georgia State University. The participants included Ralph Turlington, Florida Commissioner of Education; J.L. Gant, Florida State University; William Drummond, University of Florida; Ann Levy and June Johnson of Project New Adventure in Learning in Tallahassee; and Bill Katzenmeyer, University of South Florida (NCEE, 1983). Martha Brownlee of the Naval Education and Training for Research and Development Unit, located in Pensacola, participated in the hearings on "Education for a Productive Role in a Productive Society" (NCEE, 1983).

A Nation At Risk: The Report

Released in April 1983, the final report of the NCEE, A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, was issued as an open letter to the American people. The main conclusion from the 36-page report was that the United

States was at risk as a result of students growing up to be adults unable to compete with other nations in the areas of science, technology, industry, and commerce. As a result, the United States was seen to be losing its preeminence in the world. The mediocrity of the educational system in the United States would produce long-term problems unless needed reforms were implemented. The NCEE stressed that it would have been considered an act of war if a foreign country had imposed on the United States such a mediocre system of education (NCEE, 1983).

Holton (1984) explained that initially the Commission had merely intended to report on exemplary programs in the nation's schools. As they began to collect their data, they sensed a tremendous frustration on the part of educators, parents, and business leaders. The NCEE decided that it would be insufficient to just describe good programs. They believed that they had an obligation to go further and delineate specific changes that needed to be made in the nations' schools.

Thirteen "indicators of the risk" were described by the NCEE (1983) utilizing data-based analyses of student performance and test scores such as statistics from the College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT). Success was thus defined as being synonomous with scholastic achievement (Presseisen, 1986). More students living in the United

States were found consistently to be illiterate and weaker in the math and science areas than their counterparts in other areas of the world. It was noted by the Commission that these weaknesses came at a time when technological advances were demanding a more highly skilled work force. "For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach, those of their parents" (NCEE, 1983, p.11).

The Commission concluded that much of the decline in educational performance was attributable to declines in the educational process. Specific recommendations in five general areas to help improve the image of the United States in the world were included in the report: content standards and expectations, time, teaching, and leadership and fiscal support. These recommendations are discussed below. Repeatedly throughout the report reference was made to the positiveness of the reform process and the need for joint searching for solutions by all aspects of the lay and professional communities (NCEE, 1983, pp.12, 15, 16, 33, 36). The recommendations of the Commission were based on its belief that all students are capable of learning and would benefit from an excellent education in terms of career opportunities, as well as the ability to participate as citizens in the democratic process. In titling a section of the report

"America Can Do It" (NCEE, 1983, pp.33-34), the Commission affirmed its belief in the ability of citizens and professionals to rise to the challenge in the true spirit of American democracy (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983).

Content

The NCEE compared high school curricular offerings from 1964-69 with those of 1976-81. The Commission found that the increased number of available electives had resulted in students taking fewer basic courses and greater numbers of personal service and development subjects in areas such as psychology and sociology. In 35 states it was found that students could graduate from high schools having studied virtually no academic subjects (Holton, 1984). Today's high schools were found to offer, "a cafeteria-style curriculum in which the appetizers and the desserts can easily be mistaken for the main courses." (NCEE, 1983, p.18). The number of students in general track programs, neither vocational nor academic, had increased since 1963 from 12 to 42% (Holton, 1984).

The final report contained recommended curricular changes in English, science, social studies, math, and computer science. These subjects represented the five "new basic" content areas which would form the core of the modern high school curriculum for all students. Under the NCEE recommendations, high school students would be required to study 4

years of English; 3 years of math, science, and social studies; and a half year of computer science. It was also recommended that college-bound students study 2 years of a foreign language. Implementation recommendations and overall goals and objectives for each area of the curriculum were explained (NCEE, 1983).

A report issued by the National Center for Educational Statistics compared the recommendations of the NCEE to transcripts of 12,000 high school students who graduated in June of 1982. The report concluded that less than 3% of the graduates met the criteria recommended by the NCEE (Newsnotes, 1983).

Suggestions for foreign language study, the arts, and vocational education were also described, but the Commission did not provide details as to how its recommendations were to be financed or where support personnel would be found. Critics of the report have often ignored the fact that the Commission expressed its concern repeatedly with both the technological aspects of the curiculum, as well as the humanitarian subjects (NCEE, 1983).

Standards and Expectations

In examining standards and expectations, the NCEE evaluated scholastic achievement in high school and colleges, as well as the requirements of the programs. The members defined the expectations "in terms of the level of

knowledge, abilities, and skills school and college graduates should possess" (NCEE, 1983, p.19). Excellence was defined in terms of society, school, and the individual learner (Duke, 1985; Passow, 1984). In relation to the student, "excellence means performing on the boundary of individual ability in ways that test and push back personal limits" (NCEE, 1983, p.12) . In relation to the school, excellence was defined as setting, "high expectations and goals for all learners" (NCEE, 1983, p.12). The Commission further explained that an excellent society was one that was committed to such policies. Duke (1985) noted, that to the NCEE the pursuit of excellence by the students was as critical as their achievement of excellence. The commission members were concerned not only with the lower expectations within the schools, but also with the general shoddiness apparent to them throughout the American society.

The report writers concluded that the curriculum in the secondary schools had become too diluted, especially failing to challenge brighter students. Low standards set by poorly trained teachers precluded the schools meeting the needs of big business. Students seemed to be receiving better grades for doing less work and homework. Entrance requirements for the colleges had declined, as had the graduation requirements of the secondary schools. Expenditures for textbooks had decreased, as had the reading levels and quality of the

educational materials. According to Holton (1984), test data showed that social science students knew 80% of their textbooks' content before opening their books. The NCEE believed that the open enrollment policies of many of the universities had contributed to the decline in standards and requirements. A return to excellent schooling and a commitment to life-long learning were the overall objectives of the Commission. A "learning society" (NCEE, 1983, p.13) needed to be created that would include both formal as well as informal educational experiences.

Critics of A Nation At Risk have castigated the Commission for failing to deal with the issue of equity in the schools (Albrecht, 1984; Duke, 1985; Geske & Hoke, 1985; Gross & Gross, 1985; Hawley, 1985; Howe, 1983; Lauderdale, 1987; Odden, 1984; Peterson, 1983; Yudof, 1984). One of the areas targeted for investigation by the NCEE was education for the gifted and talented, not education for the disadvantaged. However, throughout the report, the NCEE cautioned that equity and quality education were their twin goals; that excellence should not be achieved at the expense of equity (NCEE, 1983, pp.12, 13, 15, 24, 28, 29, 32). The members of the Commission accepted that individualized programs might need to be developed for gifted and disadvantaged students. Provisions for these students were discussed in each section of the report. "Nevertheless, there remains

a common expectation: We must demand the best effort and performance from all students" (NCEE, 1983, p.24). Each student, whether college bound or not, would be prepared by the new basic academic subjects to be part of a lifelong learning society. Holton believed so strongly in the concept that it was his hope that a "right-to-education" clause be ammended to the United States Constitution (Holton, 1984, p.27).

The commission members stressed that parents and teachers needed to work together to raise the standards of the schools. The 1982 Gallup Poll of the Public´s Attitude Toward the Public Schools (Gallup, 1982) was cited, and it was noted that 75% of the people questioned supported stricter requirements for high schools students than were in effect anywhere in the country. The NCEE explained that, according to the Gallup poll, the public also supported similar stringent requirements for non-college bound students (NCEE, 1983).

The recommendation of the NCEE was that parents and teachers should expect more in terms of student behavior and achievement at all levels of schooling. Admission requirements of the colleges should be raised and grading policies in all schools revised to more accurately reflect academic achievement. The Commission advocated increased use by the secondary schools of standardized tests and other diagnostic

procedures. Such formative and summative evaluation measures would be administered at regular intervals to assess the progress and needs of students. The NCEE further recommended that textbooks be upgraded and chosen more carefully and that new instructional materials be developed. Specific materials should be made available for gifted and disadvantaged students.

Time

The three major findings of the NCEE relative to time were that (a) American students spend less time on their school work, both in terms of number of hours per day and number of days per year of attendance, than in other democratic nations; (b) school personnel were allowing students to develop poor work habits and study skills; and (c) time spent in the classrooms by the students is often wasted with a disproportionate amount of time spent on extracurricular type subjects. The recommendation of the NCEE was therefore to devote more time for the "new basics" by increasing the length of the school day or year, or by making more effective use out of the existing school day. It was further recommended that more homework be assigned on a regular basis and that students be taught proper study skills beginning at an early age. The Commission stressed that effective classroom management, along with improved organization and stronger discipline, would facilitate increased learning.

Better attendance policies, less classroom interruptions, and revised grouping and promotion procedures were suggested. Additional time for remediation and enrichment should be found for gifted and disadvantaged students, and special programs should be set up for students with discipline problems.

Teaching

The Commission found teacher training programs to be inadequate. The members explained that such programs spent too much time on method courses and not enough time on content areas. Less qualified students were being attracted to the teaching profession partially because the conditions under which the teachers were expected to work were "unacceptable" (NCEE, 1983, p.22). Teachers were found to have little say in curricular development, and to be paid such minimal salaries that many had to augment their teaching salaries by working at more than one job. A severe shortage of math, science, and foreign language teachers was found to exist throughout the United States.

Seven recommendations were made by the NCEE with the stated intent of making the teaching profession more respected by the community and rewarding for the professionals: The recommendations sought to improve the teacher training programs by raising their standards and requirements. Increased salaries were suggested for teachers, along with a

reassesment of evaluation, promotion, and tenure policies. An 11-month contract, peer review systems, career ladders, special incentives, and master-beginning teacher programs were recommended. Suggestions were presented for attracting nonschool personnel to the areas where there were teacher shortages.

Although the NCEE has been criticized for not seeking to involve teachers more in the reform process and for castigating the teaching profession for its ineptness (Atkin, 1985; Boyer, 1984; Doyle & Hartle, 1985a, 1985b; Finn, 1984, 1986b; Goodlad, 1983; Gross & Gross, 1985; Metropolitan, 1985; Shanker, 1985; Symposium, 1984; Tye & Tye, 1984), the commission members in fact specifically cautioned against seeing the teachers as scapegoats on which to blame the problems of the school system. The report writers lauded the teacher professional organizations that were involved with curriculum development and repeatedly suggested that the teachers are, and should be, an integral part of the learning team (NCEE, 1983).

Leadership and Fiscal Support

Critics of A Nation at Risk have noted that where issues of school leadership and fiscal responsibilities are raised, they are left to local initiatives (Presseisen, 1985). The NCEE explained several times in the report that it accepted the assumption that the citizens of the United

States would see the reforms as educational investments for the future, and would be willing to pay for their implementation (NCEE, 1983). Over two and a half pages at the end of the report were addressed to parents and students, without whom the commission members agreed that the reforms could not be implemented. The primary responsibility for carrying out the reforms was assigned to local levels of government. Educators and elected officials would be held accountable for facilitating the changes. Finn (1984) and Wimpelberg and Ginsberg (1985) suggested that the the NCEE report would help centralize education, as states took a more active role than local school districts.

Doyle and Hartle (1985a) noted that the increased organization and efficiency of state governments showed the executive branch that the state leaders were ready to play a leading role in educational reform. However, according to Pipho (1986c) it was the accountability movement of the 1970s which began the movement toward stronger state control of education. He explained that court cases which dealt with school finance issues in the 1970s further strengthened the states´ roles, as the clamor increased for centralized decision-making concerning minimum competencies, testing programs, and educational accountability. According to Pipho, when the educational organizations became more interested in bargaining and labor relations they did little

to improve conditions in the schools. When the NCEE issued its report, bringing the plight of the schools before the nation, lay and political leaders began to pressure the educational organizations and state legislatures for reforms.

According to Holton (1984), critics have erroneously castagated the Commission for assigning the primary responsibility for educational reform to the states. Holton explained, that in fact, the report writers repeatedly stressed the major role which the federal government must play in coordinating and helping facilitate the changes:

> The Federal Government has the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education. It should also help fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest. It must provide the national leadership to ensure that the Nation's public and private resources are marshaled to address the issues discussed in this report. (NCEE, 1983, p.33)

The commission members stipulated that the federal government would be responsible for supplementing the local initiatives of the principals, superintendents, school boards, and state legislators. It was further recommended that the federal government be responsible for meeting the needs of the gifted and disadvantaged students.

Major Social Forces and Motivational Factors

Changing Social Forces in the 1980s

The formation of the NCEE can be seen as a response to specific social, economic, political, and educational

factors: A College Board study released in 1975, showing a steady decrease since 1963 in SAT scores nationally, helped renew interest in school reform (Atkin, 1985; Doyle & Hartle, 1985; Ravitch, 1985). It was generally believed that a decrease in the quality of secondary schools since World War II had resulted in students who were educationally unprepared for college. This, in turn, produced teachers who graduated from the colleges with poor cognitive skills and who were responsible for teaching the next generation of students (Trow, 1985). The increase in the number of available curricular electives and a decrease in requirements at both the high school and college levels were perceived as fragmenting the typical student's curriculum (Ravitch, 1985). Slowly educators and lay leaders began to agree on the need to reevaluate the relationship between the colleges and the secondary schools.

Tyler (1982) noted that educational reform periods in the United States have generally resulted from economic recessions. As finances become tighter, lay and educational leaders were forced to examine appropriations to the nation's schools. This self-examination led to reforms as the experts tried to justify the educational expenditures.

"Learning is the indispensible investment required for success in the `information age' we are entering" (NCEE, 1983, p.7). The changing role of technology in the society

of the 1980s and its precipitative role in facilitating the need for educational reform, has been documented by many researchers (Cleveland, 1986; Naisbitt, 1982; Ravitch, 1983, 1984, 1985). Ravitch (1985) referred to the economy shift as a shift from "smokestack industries to technical and knowledge based industries" (p.17). The major reform reports of the 1980s appear to have been inspired by increased international competition in technological areas. As Japan and other countries appeared to threaten our commercial supremacy, people began to believe that schools had to improve in order to better the economic situation in the United States (Passow, 1984). The members of the NCEE were concerned with facilitating the competencies of American youth, especially in the areas of math, science, and technology. Labeling 1984 as "a year of excellence in education," (1984, p.13) President Reagan stressed that an informed citizenry was critical for world peace.

The new partnership which resulted between the business and the education communities in the 1980s has been documented by several authors (Albrecht, 1984; Atkin, 1985; Goldberg & Harvey, 1983; Timpane, 1984; Yeakey & Johnston, 1985). Odden (1984), an assistant excecutive director of the Education Commission of the States, explained that the reform reports brought with their publication a hope of renewed economic growth. Chandler (1983) viewed A Nation

At Risk as a political document designed to generate workers for business and industry. Atkin (1985) noted that after Sputnik college professors took the lead in proposing educational reforms. In 1983, however, it was the business leaders who were at the forefront of the reform efforts. Ravitch added that whereas in 1959 educational reforms centered around the needs of the gifted student, in 1983 the NCEE sought to develop a common curriculum from which all students and industry could benefit (Ravitch, 1985). Thus, the NCEE was concerned with developing in students an understanding of the necessity for life-long learning as a means of dealing with changes in society as a whole, and the workplace in particular. Welsh (1986) pointed out that the irony of the reform reports of the 1980s was that while they catered to the business world by including objective, often measurable business-oriented vocabulary and concepts in their proposals, the business world was, at the same time, already recognizing the need for more affective, humanistic forms of management and organizational style.

Finn explained that the flurry of reform reports in 1983 resulted from the increasing gap between what citizens wanted from the schools and what the schools were providing (Finn, 1984). In his opinion, political action and educational reform were inevitable. Hawkins (1985) also noted that the widening chasm between educational realities and

reform theories resulted from the political failure of the public schools. Hawkins explained that, since 1957, reforms increased public school related problems as parents, students, and society continued to clash over basic differences. As a result, educational reform became a priority for many segments of the society. Some hoped for a political restructuring of the system leading to increased local control, whereas others hoped to use the reforms to increase the centralization of the school systems. Hawkins thus saw the reform proposals as generating from political as well as educational concerns (Hawkins, 1985).

Spring (1984) agreed that the reforms suggested by the NCEE report were designed to meet the political and economic needs of the American capitalistic society. He suggested, however, that schools would continue to be in a state of chaos as long as they continued to be "captive to the profit motive of United States industry" (p.535). Whereas A Nation at Risk stated that improving education would help solve the economic problems of the United States (NCEE, 1983), Spring (1984) insisted that although the schools would provide an increased pool of efficient workers for the labor force, school reform could not answer basic economic and social problems of the country.

Education has often preceded and set the stage for political decisions in the United States (Cremin, 1977). In

the cases of the task forces convened in the early 1980s, educational needs appear to have merged with political expediency (Chandler, 1983; United States Department of Education, 1984; Wimpelberg & Ginsberg, 1985). Several political and educational leaders, including four former United State´s Commissioners of Education, Marland, Keppel, Howe, and Boyer, have explained that the formation of the NCEE was politically motivated by President Reagan (Gross & Gross, 1985). The President was said to have realized that the climate was favorable for educational reform, since two dozen committees were already examining education in the United States before the NCEE was appointed (Ravitch, 1985). President Reagan himself had raised the need for educational reforms in 1981, two years prior to the issuance of the NCEE report. At that time, however, the issue wasn´t considered as important an item on the Republican agenda as it became by 1983 with the strengthening of the conservative wing of the Republican party (Bell, 1986, 1984).

The conservative educational climate of the 1980s has been contrasted with the liberal climate of the 1970s by several educational historians (Gross & Gross, 1985; James & Tyack, 1983; Ravitch, 1983, 1984). James and Tyack (1983) explained that the politically and economically conservative 1980s motivated the conservative "back to basics" philosophy of the NCEE. Presseisen (1985) saw the formation of the NCEE

as resulting from the nation´s leadership needing to legitimatize the basic conservative goals and philosophies in a period of rapid social change. "So conventional are contemporary reforms that future educational historians are likely to look back on the present not as the birth of a new age of educational excellence, but as the death throes of the back to basics movement." (Duke, 1985, p.673). Wimpelberg and Ginsberg (1985) suggested that A Nation at Risk writers sought to create a sense of urgency in order to facilitate educational policies already formulated by President Reagan and the United States Department of Education.

Both President Reagan and Secretary of Education Bell were known to have favored decreased federal intervention in education and increased local responsibility. Bell stated (1986) that a major objective of his 4-year tenure as Secretary of Education was to preserve the traditional limited role of the federal government in education. Following the release of the NCEE report, President Reagan blamed the interference of preceding administrations with causing major problems within the school systems (Wimpelberg & Ginsberg, 1985). Wimpelberg and Ginsberg noted that given President Reagan´s political views, the NCEE, created to investigate deficiencies in the public schools, found problems that existed and suggested reforms consistent with the government´s conservative educational policies.

In an article entitled, "Government by Commission" (1966), Bell described what he viewed to be the general functions of federal commissions. Wimpelberg and Ginsberg (1985) noted that A Nation at Risk fulfilled all of the major purposes of a commission as described by Bell: The NCEE served as an advisory board to President Reagan and Bell; evaluated an important issue in a media-oriented fashion; recommended policy alternatives; and served as an outstanding public relations "gimick" through which the government's policies could be explained.

Howe (1983) and Lewis (1984) noted that the NCEE recommendations were not as conservative as President Reagan might have wished. The final report did not mention the president's desire for increased parents' rights, school prayer, and tuition vouchers. Bell (1986) described in detail the philosophic differences which existed between his moderate conservative viewpoints and those of the radical "right" within the Reagan administration who insisted that federal monies should not be allocated for education. Given the pressures from the radical right and the conservative viewpoints of President Reagan, the NCEE report appears to have been less conservative a document then might have been anticipated.

Bell explained that it was the popularity of A Nation at Risk in the 1984 election year which prevented his

Republican conservative opponents from promoting an even more conservative platform. Sensing the mood of the public, President Reagan gave 51 major speeches on education in the 18-month period before the 1984 elections, as key Republican figures withdrew their call for budgetary cutbacks for education (Bell, 1986). Clark, Astuto, and Rooney (1983) echoed Bell's interpretation of events preceding and following the publication of A Nation at Risk.

In a fascinating article, "A Nation at Risk Revisited" (1984), Holton described his initial reluctance to serve on the Commission. Given President Reagan's stated intent to abolish the United States Department of Education, Holton had little hope for the Commission to be able to facilitate any meaningful reforms. When President Reagan met with the group for the first time in October 1981 the President outlined his suggestions for educational reform. Nineteen months later, when President Reagan officially accepted the report before the media, the President appeared to ignore the conclusions of the report which he had been given several days earlier to read. Instead he endorsed tuition tax credits, vouchers, and voluntary prayer in the schools--the same issues he had discussed with the Commission members in October of 1981, none of which were mentioned in A Nation at Risk. Holton suggested that a great deal of the initial confusion and negative reaction to the report resulted from

the press' reaction to President Reagan's statements at the time of the release of the report. The commission member explained that although Bell completely endorsed the conclusions of A Nation at Risk, Bell hoped for an end to federal funding for education, as the states took over the reform process. The commission members, however, favored strong federal guidance over the local initiatives (see above).

Adelson (1985), an educator who wrote a position paper for the NCEE and met formally and informally with commission members, wrote that he expected A Nation at Risk to be a more reactionary document. Based on his interactions with the members of the NCEE, Adelson expressed surprise that the final report was less cautious then the commission members had indicated and received more public attention then was expected. "The commission membership appeared so diverse in background and disparate in views that an essentially political document, marked by restraint and compromise, seemed to be required if a report was to be issued at all" (Adelson, 1985, p.17).

Critics have explained that the major educational commissions that were convened in the early 1980s were not intended to serve as objective, fact finding, analytical committees, but rather to dramatize the issue of educational reform (Deal, 1985; Duke, 1985; Passow, 1984; Peterson, 1983). Yudof (1984) noted that the reforms of the 1980s have

not been shaped by data from educational research, but rather by subjective, perceived feelings concerning the consensus of public opinion. Though much of the data used by the NCEE was outdated and test scores since then appear to be rising, Walberg (1986) noted that recent 1985 statistics still showed United States students to be behind their European counterparts in certain areas. Stedman and Kaestle (1985) also reported that test scores within the United States have been rising since the late 1970s.

Paul Peterson (1983), Director of the Government Studies Program of the Brookings Institute, noted that the very nature of the NCEE and the time restraints put upon it precluded the Commission from taking the time to do the type of in-depth studies needed to produce meaningful data. Peterson explained that whenever a commission is appointed and given time limitations within which to deal with major social issues, certain outcomes become inevitable: The report of the commisison would exaggerate the problem it addresses; overly broad objectives would be stated; changes that are recommended would be beyond current technology, personnel, and fiscal resources; recommended innovations would not be detailed; major organizational changes would rarely be called for; and the commission would poorly document its findings. Peterson (1983) concluded that the

findings of the NCEE were often based on outdated, subjective data.

Stedman and Smith (1983) suggested that the members of the NCEE actually ignored the conclusions of many of their commissioned studies when compiling their final report. Presseisen (1985) agreed that the recommendations of the NCEE were not related directly to the commissioned reports cited in the appendix of A Nation at Risk and that, in fact, the report rarely cited the commissioned papers. The polemical nature of A Nation At Risk, a best seller of 1983, has been discussed by many critics, including Ginsberg and Wimpelberg (1985), Honig (1985), Howe (1983), and Stedman and Smith (1983).

Prominent Educators From the NCEE

The personal writings of some of its members provide further insights into the motivations of the NCEE. Since not all of the appointees were leading educators, primary sources were found for only six of the commission members. An analysis of the primary sources authored by these six members of the NCEE supports the conclusion that the Commission was comprised of a diverse panel of experts, but few educators.

John Gardner, Chairman of the NCEE, is an expert in the field of higher education. In "The Individual and Society" (Gardner, 1976) Gardner expressed his belief in protecting

the rights of the individual in an increasingly technological society. A vital concern of the modern citizen, according to Gardner, is the ability to balance personal needs against those of the modern community. The university's role was to help the students achieve this ideal balance; to preserve the traditions of the past, while helping the students deal with the present and the future (1984). In Higher Education and Government: An Uneasy Alliance (Gardner, 1979), Gardner expressed his conviction that colleges needed to maintain their autonomy in a pluralistic society. Minimal government intervention in education was a necessity in order for the colleges to maintain fiscal and educational integrity.

Gerald Holton, a physicist and educator, was born in Berlin in 1922. He served as a visiting professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology before joining the staff at Harvard in 1943. From 1957-1961 he edited Daedalus and has been the Editor of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences since 1957. Mallinckrodt Professor of Physics at Harvard, Holton has published many books on physics, as well as the history and philosophy of science (1970; 1978a). Many essays on leadership and democracy from Daedalus were included in Excellence and Leadership in a Democracy (Graubard & Holton, 1962). In Limits of Scientific Inquiry, Holton (1978b) questioned if limits should be placed on

science in a technologically advanced world. A person's relationship to the changing society was of critical interest to Holton.

According to Goldberg and Harvey (1983), who worked for the Commission, the concept of publishing the report of the NCEE as an open letter to American citizens was that of David Gardner and strongly supported by Gerald Holton. The format was intended to remind Americans that education was important to them in terms of their security and prosperity.

A. Bartlett Giamatti, President of Yale in 1983, was a Renaissance and medieval literature scholar. He has authored many books specializing in the Renaissance and the works of Dante (1966). In 1979 he received an honorary title of Commander in the Order of Merit from the Italian government and was elected a fellow by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1980. Interestingly, Giamatti's book on Dante (1983) included an essay by W.T. Harris of the Committee of Ten.

Born in 1917, Anne Campbell served as Superintendent of Schools in Madison County, Nebraska, from 1957 through 1963. An activist on women's issues, Campbell served on many Nebraska state commissions related to themes including education, children, youth, and women. Three books dealing with topics related to women and psychology were found to be

authored or coauthored by Campbell (Campbell, 1981, 1984; Marsh & Campbell, 1982).

Shirley C. Gordon has authored or coauthored several books on education in the Caribbean (Augier & Gordon, 1973; Gordon, 1968; 1983a) and on how the recommendations of the NCEE can be applied to community and junior colleges (Gordon, 1983b). G.T. Seaborg was appointed Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission by President Kennedy, while serving as Chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley. Seaborg has written widely on scientific issues (Hyde, Perlman, & Seaborg 1971; Katz, Seaborg, & Morse, 1986; Seaborg, 1963; Seaborg & Corliss 1971), as well as on the relationship between the scientific and political communities (1981).

Reaction to A Nation At Risk

Many authors have pointed to A Nation at Risk as being the key report that led to the explosion of American educational reform proposals beginning in the spring of 1983 (Clark, Astuto,& Rooney, 1983; Ginsberg & Wimpelberg, 1985; Goldberg & Harvey, 1983; Gordon, 1983; Yeakay & Johnston, 1985). Superlatives concerning the nation's response to the NCEE report abound, as well as comparisons to the influence which Sputnik had on education in 1959 (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983; Holton, 1984; Pipho, 1983; Ravitch, 1985). President

Reagan (1984) viewed the "tidal wave" of school reform proposals that grew out of the NCEE report, as representing a "grassroots revolution" in education (p.15). Pipho (1984b) referred to 1984 as "a year of transition for education" (p.661). Secretary of Education Terrel Bell and others have stressed that 1984 represented a turning point in American education (Bell, 1984; Lewis, 1984). Doyle and Hartle (1985a), Goldberg and Harvey (1983), and Toch (1984) noted that school reform became a media event through the participation of thousands of Americans at conventions; interviews and commentaries in newspaper and magazine articles; and special reports on television talk shows including "Nightline", "The McNeil-Lehrer Report" and "Good Morning America". Every 3 weeks for 18 months a public event was held by the Commission somewhere in the United States, which received media coverage (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983). After the release of the NCEE report, Dominick (1984) reported that the coverage of educational issues by the network media increased significantly. By September 1983, the United States Government Printing Office was into the fourth printing of A Nation at Risk. Over 6 million readers were said to have read over 200,000 copies of the large type, easy to read, report which appeared in various publications (Holton, 1984).

Bell noted that 12 regional forums convened in 1984 involving over 10,000 citizens. The December 1984 National Forum on Excellence in Education held in Indianapolis drew 2,300 educators (Bell, 1984). The National Governors Association developed the "Governor's Action Plan" aimed at assisting the state and local agencies to work together to facilitate educational reform via increased communication. Seven task forces were appointed to work from 1985 through 1991 on concrete reform proposals growing out of the NCEE recommendations (Pipho, 1985b). The task force on Education for Economic Growth of the Education Commission of the States reviewed the reform proposals of 46 states (Education Commission of the States, 1984). The United States Department of Education (1984) monitored reactions to the report in all the states and several education related agencies (see below). As a result of the NCEE report, Bell reported (1984) that, "American education is on the mend after two decades of decline" (p.534).

Not all of the reaction to A Nation at Risk was as positive, but Ravitch (1985) noted that even the most ardent critics of the Commission still seemed to accept as a given the beneficience of education. Finn (1985a) detailed over 10 points of friction between the authors of A Nation At Risk, whom he believed were influenced by business leaders, and the perceptions of educators in the field, who were

expected to carry out the proposed reforms (pp.64-66). Many business leaders were unconcerned with core educational issues such as the individualization of the curriculum or the self esteem of the learner. Educators objected to the report's prescriptive nature, which they viewed as dictating to the educators how to do their job. The professionals also rejected what they saw as a basic premise of the excellence movement, that some children would fail under the suggested system of regimented education. Teachers felt threatened by the call for increased accountability in the schools via measurable criteria. Educational organization leaders expressed their concern with the quality of the curriculum, versus the quantitative concerns of the reform report.

Finn (1984) further described the insistance of the educators that more monies needed to be allocated before the recommendations of the NCEE could be seriously considered. Educational leaders rejected the notion of a typical school which the NCEE said that they described. Many critics expressed their frustrations with the NCEE's dwelling on problems rather than suggesting substantial curricular and methodological reforms. To many it seemed as if excellence was to be achieved at the expense of equity. Other authors, such as Yeakay and Johnston (1985), have developed checklists of criticisms similar to Finn (Antonalli, 1984).

Albrecht (1984) accused the NCEE of planting "seeds of mischief" (p.684) by the tone of urgency inherent in the report. He compared the air of legitimacy that the NCEE had, because it was a governmental agency, to Moses. Despite the omission of key issues from the report, Albrecht noted that many educators believed that they dare not critique A Nation At Risk lest they be accused of being defensive and anti-change. Sarason (1983) commented that Americans tend to expect too much from the public school system. Hasty reforms are often implemented in a faddish manner, when the schools become scapegoats for the problems of society. Other critics have also chastized the NCEE for the urgent tone inherent in their final report (Adelson, 1985; Breckenridge, 1984; Ginsberg & Wimpelberg, 1985; Peterson, 1983).

Many professional educators questioned whether the NCEE report merely represented the most recent educational bandwagon, or a new program of substantive reform proposals (Albrecht,1984; Fernandez, 1985; Goodlad, 1983; Leonard, 1984; Peterson, 1983; Yudof, 1984). Writing in the NASSP Bulletin, Fernandez (1985) suggested that if education in the nation´s schools was superior in the 1950s, then instead of looking for new panaceas, educators should have returned to the curriculum and teaching methodologies of that period.

Finn (1986a) viewed professional and lay reaction to the NCEE report as representing a duel between two

philosophies. Many supporters of the report desired a classical form of education for all students. Critics wanted a vocational education alternative track for students who did not plan to continue on to college. Albrecht (1984) and Goodman (1984) noted that A Nation At Risk implicitly set up the college-bound pupil as the normative student. Chandler (1983) viewed the recommended NCEE curriculum as a traditional college preparatory program. Passow explained (1984) that

> in fact, the debate over `excellence´ simply reopens the ideological schism between those who believe that there is a common culture to be transmitted to all through a common curriculum and those who believe in individualized, differentiated programs focused on student´s needs. (p.680)

The ojective of the Commission, according to Wyatt (cited in Symposium, 1984) was to decrease the number of electives available to the students in the schools. Fernandez suggested that the NCEE should have called their report "A Nation at Odds". Chandler agreed (1983) that people in different sections of the country have different views as to what the overall objectives of the schools are now and what they should be in the future. The need to compare and contrast the goals of the schools to those of the NCEE has been suggested by several authors including Hacker (1984) and Roth (1984).

Yeakay and Johnston (1985) hypothesized that implementation of the reforms suggested by the NCEE would

lead to only one major change in the public school system--a more stratified organization, which would separate the able students from the unable. Goodman (1984) argued that an educational elite would result from the commission's recommendations, and questioned the assumption of the NCEE that the main objective of schools should be for students to pursue excellence in preparation for college. Woodring (1983) suggested that the NCEE report would lead to increased numbers of high school dropouts as a result of failure to deal with individualized instruction. He believed that students would find the new intensive curriculum irrelevant to the realities of their future occupations. Clement (1983) explained that the NCEE, "embeds in its findings and recommendations a popular American myth: everything can be fixed; it takes only working harder to do so" (p.20). Duke noted (1985) that many critics saw the NCEE standards of excellence as little more than minimum competencies.

Albrecht (1984) stressed that the "more is better" inherent philosophy of A Nation At Risk, which led to recommendations of longer school days, more homework, and tougher standards, would lead to an increased number of school dropouts. Winn (1983) referred to these NCEE recommendations as "stuffing the turkey" or "stretching the rubber band" (p.185). Either, when overdone, tends to burst

or pop, defeating the original intended purpose. To Albrecht, the NCEE (by rejecting mediocrity) provided educators with a legitimate means of "chasing" problem students from the school system (p.684). Albrecht and Duea (1983), Best (1984), Cardenas and First (1985), Chandler (1983), Duckworth (cited in Symposium, 1984), Goodlad (1983), Welsh (1986), and Yeakey and Johnston (1985) noted similar concerns and stressed that meaningful educational reforms needed to take into account students´ nonintellectual needs, as well as academic areas.

Goodman (1984) and Passow (1984), concluded that the major reform proposals of the 1980s were simplistic, conservative, and unrealistic. Passow (1984) viewed the call in the 1980s for a tighter prescribed curriculum with more rigorous courses as being a response to the electives and curricular alternatives proposed in the 1970s. Passow saw the NCEE report as dealing with the past and present but not really with the future. Although the authors of A Nation At Risk accepted the imminence of a high tech society, Passow believed that they did not deal with the question of how students should be trained to prepare for their new roles in this society. To Passow, a pluralistic society required a more diversified, individualized curriculum than that suggested by the NCEE.

Several educational and lay leaders have criticized the NCEE for failing to deal in the final report with many critical educational issues including the financial implementation of the reforms, equity, vocational education, and disadvantaged or problem children (Albrecht, 1984; Duke, 1985; Geske & Hoke, 1985; Gross & Gross,1985; Howe, 1983; Lauderdale, 1987; Odden, 1984; Peterson, 1983, Yudof, 1984). Hawley (1985) stressed that in certain areas, such as equity, the report may have mentioned the issue, but it did so in only a token manner, without providing any substantial suggestions for implementation. However, it has already been noted above that much of this criticism appears to be unfounded given the stated limited objectives of the NCEE. In fact, Cohen (cited in Symposium, 1984) noted that the major reports of 1983 represented the first time in the history of education that reformers paid serious consideration to the issues of equity and equality.

Cohen (cited in Symposium, 1984), Hacker (1984), and Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, and Cusick (1985) faulted the NCEE for not contemplating social interactions between students and educators and the degree to which students have distanced themselves from the educational process. Welsh (1986) noted that the 1983 reform reports failed to deal with social and economic factors which might impede the implementation of the reforms. Changes which have occured in family

configurations should have been investigated. A greater portion of the blame for the failure of the schools should have been assigned to parents, according to Hacker (1984). Goldberg and Harvey (1983) responded to such criticism by noting that throughout the report the Commission stressed its belief in the important role which the public must play in implementing the reforms.

Elementary school education was virtually ignored by members of the Commission as they concerned themselves with cognitive high school goals (Howe, 1983; Ravitch 1985). According to Chandler (1983), their concerns resulted from the interests of industry in a strengthened work force. The proposed NCEE changes for teacher training programs, according to Chandler (1983), would hurt early childhood and elementary schools, where training in methodologies is seen as more important than training in the content areas. Holton (1984), however, noted that the NCEE charter specifically mandated the Commission to look at high school programs.

Atkin (1985); Boyer (1984); Doyle and Hartle (1985b); Finn (1986b); Goodlad (1983); Gross and Gross (1985); Howe, Duckworth, and Cohen (cited in symposium, 1984); Shanker (1985); and Tye and Tye (1984) explained that if the proposed reforms are to work, the teachers will have to be given a more active say in the decision-making process and

the actual implementation of the curricular changes. Educational reforms advocated from the top down and imposed on teachers by the administration and lay leaders have been shown by educational history to be doomed to fail. Goodlad suggested the importance of allowing school leaders to become self-directing, and thus plan their own changes. Brown (1986) reported that a major negative effect has been to decrease the status of teachers and lower their morale. He described the U.S. News and World Report cover which featured a teacher wearing a dunce cap, indicting teachers by implication for the supposed failure of the schools.

Block (1983) and others have criticized the NCEE for their negative view of public schools. Block noted that educators recognize that problems exist, but that another "foul shot at American education" accomplishes nothing (p.183). However, Goldberg and Harvey (1983) criticized the press for its viewing A Nation At Risk as an attack on education. Instead, the members of the Commission, according to Goldberg and Harvey (1983) and Ravitch (1985), viewed the report as a reaffirmation of society's traditional belief in the importance of education in America.

A misuse of statistical data, according to Ravitch (1985), led to the erroneous conclusion by the NCEE that students entering the teaching profession are academically weaker. She noted that since secondary school teachers

rarely major in education, the qualifications of teachers cannot be analyzed by looking at narrow indicators such as the grade point averages of students in training programs.

From the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company's survey of teachers (1985) it was found that teachers believed that the reforms reflected administrative views, and that in states where reforms have been implemented teachers were more likely to see the reforms as negative. Two-thirds of the teachers believed that they had no significant impact in the formulation of reforms in their schools. It was concluded that the major reform proposals of 1983 have precipitated a great deal of teacher dissatisfaction resulting in many teachers leaving, or planning to leave, the field of education.

The reaction of the leading teacher unions was mixed. The NEA objected to lay and political leaders interfering in educational issues. Opposed to the testing of teachers, the NEA insisted that the schools were not in such bad shape, and suggested that the schools continue to carry out the NEA objectives and reforms, instead of jumping on the NCEE bandwagon (Finn, 1985b; Shanker, 1984b, 1985). The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) joined with the NEA in opposing merit pay and career ladder programs. The AFT leadership, however, long a proponent of tough academic standards, welcomed the participation of politicians and laypeople in

the educational reform process (Finn, 1985b). Shanker (1985), President of the AFT, reported that the immediate reaction of the teachers to the NCEE report was cynicism, which soon changed to hope. The NEA eventually took a more moderate stance, backing the general society's desire for reform.

Ravitch (1985) suggested that many teachers objected to the conclusions of the NCEE because teachers tend to traditionally accept a laissez-faire attitude towards the over-molding of students. The teachers thus viewed the new curricular mandates of A Nation At Risk as being too restrictive of individual choices.

Some criticisms of A Nation At Risk centered on the premise of the NCEE that comparisons could be made between European and American students. Walberg (1986) suggested that many of the statistical comparisons that were made were invalid because Americans tended to stay in school longer than their European counterparts. The validity of cognitive data is also questionable, given that many other countries have centralized educational organizations or ministries and national curriculum. The school systems in Europe and the United States appear to be more complex than the NCEE would have had us believe (Symposium, 1984).

Highlights of Legislative Reaction to a Nation At Risk

Described in this section is some of the key legislation which resulted from the publication of A Nation at Risk; hundreds of state-level task force reports issued since 1983 have resulted in the passage (and at times repeal) of a considerable amount of legislation (Bridgman, 1985). Pipho (1986c) noted that legislative action received more press coverage than did the reform proposals prepared by state boards of education. He explained that the state legislative process was more visible than the slower board initiated reforms. Although some of the earlier state reform bills might have resulted even without A Nation at Risk, Pipho (1986c) believed that the frenzy of educational legislation enacted after 1983 was due to the favorable climate for reform generated by the NCEE report.

The California legislature, during the summer of 1983, passed a reform bill that made 80 changes in the education code of kindergarten through 12th grade. Incentives were included for schools to lengthen their day and school year and to set up special programs aimed at improving student achievement. The law included a merit pay program for teachers, higher salaries, and a pilot program to encourage improved educational methodologies in the classroom (Pipho, 1986c).

A 38-day special session of the Arkansas legislature resulted in requiring eighth grade students to pass a competency test before being promoted. Any school district where at least 85% of the students did not pass the exam would lose its accreditation. Competency tests were also mandated for teacher recertification (Pipho, 1986c).

In January of 1984, Tennessee passed a comprehensive education bill in a special session of the state legislature. A 5-step career ladder for teachers and school administrators was created. Pay raises were mandated along with guidelines for improved teacher training and evaluation programs. A one cent increase in the state sales tax was approved to help pay for the reform program, which also included a longer school year and the addition of teaching assistants in the elementary schools (Pipho, 1986a, 1986c).

Similar reforms were enacted in a special 23-day legislative session in Texas, ending in June 1984. The Texas legislature banned social promotion, placed limits on participation in extracurricular activities, and stipulated that students not maintaining the new passing grade point average of 70 would be banned from partcipating in extra-curricular activities. Pipho noted that this "no-pass/no-play" provision, although considered radical at the time of its passage, has since been emulated in several other states

including South Carolina, West Virginia, and New Mexico (Pipho, 1986a).

South Carolina's Education Improvement Act of 1984 mandated the raising of $213 million, via a one cent sales tax, to help pay for the reforms. The law increased the length of the school day and year and strengthened academic standards along with graduation requirements. Stricter attendance policies were suggested, as were lower pupil-teacher ratios and competency testing programs. Incentives were made available for all school personnel who helped achieve educational excellence. Increased revenues were earmarked for new school construction, as well as the renovation of older structures (Pipho, 1986c).

The Georgia legislature passed the Quality Basic Education Act in March of 1985. The legislature committed itself to spending $231 million for the first year of reform and hoped to increase the amount to $700 million by 1990. The reform law included competency testing and improved evaluation programs, increased salaries for all school personnel, and the institution of a mandatory state-funded kindergarten program. Kindergarten children were to be tested to determine readiness to move to first grade, and specific competencies were established for all levels of schooling (Pipho, 1986c).

The flurry of reform legislation continued throughout the country in 1985. The Missouri legislature passed a comprehensive reform package which included a career ladder program, salary increases, competency testing, improved training programs for teachers, and incentives for all school personnel. The Massachusetts legislature scaled down a comprehensive 1984 reform package, but included two new provisions: one allocated more funding for poorer school districts and one mandated that local governments could reject state funding for educational reforms, even if local boards had approved those reforms (Pipho, 1986c). The Oklahoma legislature increased its allocation by 20% to the secondary school programs of the state, while reducing class size, mandating standardized testing at specific grade levels, mandating teacher evaluation schedules, and increasing funding for early childhood programs. The Illinois legislature required school districts to delineate instructional objectives for each student in the system, improve teacher training and evaluation programs, and ban social promotion. A controversial inclusion in the Illinois bill was its plan for reorganization of the schools, which would result in the consolidation of some school districts (Pipho, 1986c).

After trying for 3 years, in 1986 the New Mexico legislature mandated a substantial salary increase for teachers,

but eliminated their right for tenure. Lower pupil-teacher ratios were suggested, and recommendations were made for curricular changes, while delineating the amount of time to be spent in basic areas (Pipho, 1986c).

Pipho (1986a, 1986c) reported that between 200 and 300 state-level task forces been convened since 1983, resulting in leaders in 40 states changing their graduation requirements and leaders in over 30 states dealing with the question of career ladders. In most states changes have been made in teacher training and recertification programs. In 1982, in 20 states the testing of teachers before certification was required. In 1986 that number increased by 50%. In comparing the recommendations of the NCEE with legislative reforms, Pipho found that in 1986 the commission's guidelines for English had been met in 15 states, in 11 for math, in 5 for science, in 15 for social studies, and in 6 for computer science. In no state had the foreign language recommendation been met. Legislatures in 5 states increased the length of the school year and the school day. Pipho (1986a) concluded:

> Local school districts, individual schools, and colleges are `thinking and acting' in pursuit of reform. Parents, taxpayers, and business leaders understand the concept of reform, and education reform has become a fact of life (p.702).

Reform Efforts in Florida

Florida, with its 67 school districts, 2,111 elementary and secondary schools (Turlington, 1986), is recognized as having made some of the most extensive education reforms in the country (Bondi & Wiles, 1986; R. Graham, 1984; Mollison, 1984; Pipho, 1986b). A U.S. Department of Education report, covering the period from the issuance of the NCEE report through October of 1984, showed that out of the 19 most popular reforms being discussed in state legislatures, Florida was the state in which the legislature acted on the most--18 out of the 19 (United States Department of Education, 1984). The average state enacted only 8 of the 19 reforms (Mollison, 1984). Mollison reported that as a result of the reforms passed by the legislature in 1983, Florida would have the most stringent graduation reforms of any state by 1987.

Governor Robert Graham played a major role in extending the 1983 Florida legislative session; he called three special sessions to ensure the passage of a collection of educational reform laws known as the RAISE bill, (Raise Achievement in Secondary Education, 1983). The RAISE bill stipulated that all graduating seniors in Florida had to have completed an upgraded curriculum with an emphasis on academic courses in the areas of math, science, and computer science (Turlington, 1986; United States Department of

Education, 1984). The bill included the phasing out of remediation programs by 1990, establishing performance objectives for all high school courses, and increasing requirements for teachers wanting to teach in secondary schools. Funding was provided for special writing programs which would require each 10th grade student to write a paper each week and for incentives to attract professionals from the community into teaching. Initial steps were taken to implement a merit pay program for teachers.

Twenty-eight regional coordinating vocational education councils were established; these were aimed at improving instruction in the schools (Pipho, 1986c). One of these councils was the Florida Quality Instruction Incentives Council which sought to develop summative and formative evaluation instruments for students, teachers, and school administrators; develop a merit pay plan; and monitor implementation of the education reform laws (Pipho, 1983). The RAISE bill created a standardized testing program and raised college admissions requirements. Of the 22 credits required for graduation in 1983 and raised to 24 in 1986, 15 were mandated by name by the state legislature. Thirty million dollars were earmarked for increased laboratory instruction for students in K-12. In 1985 the state legislature extended the curricular, testing, and objective guidelines of the RAISE bill to include grades 6-12. In 1986 the

testing requirements in each curricular area were further specified (Bondi & Wiles, 1986).

The Florida Accountability in Curriculum, Educational Instructional Materials, and Testing Act (FACET) creating a statewide system of educational evaluation, was passed in 1984 (Turlington, 1986). The legislatures who passed the act sought by 1989 to be able to study student achievement and the quality of Florida schools by analyzing valid and reliable comparative data on student performance. New curricular guidelines, student performance standards, and testing procedures were to be designated which would allow the schools to increase their accountability to the legislature and to the parents of the students. Teacher salaries by 1989 were to be in the top 25% of the nation.

The 1984 Florida legislature also increased by 10.75% state funding for education via a tax increase, set up a 12-member advisory committee to continue work on the carreer ladder program, and established new guidelines for the certification of new teachers (Pipho, 1986c). Members of the Florida legislature, along with the governor and members of the United States Department of Education, participated in a national conference on improving textbooks and instructional materials in March of 1984. In the same month a study, "Children at Risk, on discipline problems in Florida was reported (United States Department of Education, 1984). One

million dollars were earmarked for academic enrichment programs. Students earning less than a 1.5 average (out of a possible 4.0 were forbidden to participate in extracurricular activites.

The master teacher plan adopted in Florida in 1984 met with resistance on several grounds (Pipho, 1986b). It was thought that only 3% of the state's teachers would qualify for the one-time special grant, funded by only 9.5 million dollars. A 3-step career ladder was developed, to be instituted during the 1987-1988 school year. The first step required the participation by beginning teachers without their receiving any special compensation. Teachers who had taught for 4 years and successfully completed specific evaluation and testing procedures, would be eligible for the second step. Teachers with masters degrees who taught for 6 years at the second step and completed specified evaluation and testing procedures, would be eligible for the incentives available at the third step. These third-step teachers would also be given additional responsibilites in their schools.

The law mandated that local school district leaders would devise their own career ladder programs under the state guidelines, with the approval of the state board of education. A provision in the law called for the repealing of the bill if 90 million dollars was not earmarked for

funding the career ladder by July 1988. Until the 90 million dollars was allocated, only up to 28% of the Florida teachers would be able to participate in the second career level.

In 1986, Florida Commissioner of Education Ralph Turlington identified 10 goals for the educational system. They included increased teacher salaries, improvements in grades 4-8 resulting from the Progress in Middle Childhood Education (PRIME) program, dropout identification and prevention, improved text-books and teaching materials, performance-based accountability, better feedback to high schools from colleges through the Florida Information Resources Network (FIRN), better-prepared principals, better-qualified teachhers, increased achievement by college students who will have benfitted from completing high school programs with raised standards, and increased college opportunities.

Bondi and Wiles (1986) stressed that the increased requirements for graduation and the tougher standards which were developed in Florida since 1983, contributed to the state having the largest dropout rate in the country. In 1984, the state legislature earmarked one million dollars for a dropout prevention program. In 1985, the expenditure was increased to $1,575,000 (Turlington, 1986). Bondi and Wiles (1986) reported that teacher and student absenteeism, and discipline problems had also increased. On the other

hand, Turlington (1986) reported that since the NCEE report and the subsequent implementation of reforms, Florida students had consistently scored above the national average on College Board achievement tests.

Summary

A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, the report of the National Commision on Excellence in education (1983), is a conservative document, reflecting a redirection of this country's educational institutions during a period of national economic transformation from an industrial based to a technology-oriented economy. The conservative orientation of the report, as well as the changing economic, social, and political forces have been documented. The NCEE was commissioned by a conservative Secretary of Education and appointed by an even more conservative president. Membership on the Commission was not limited to leading educators. The influence of the business community on the NCEE and the role played by the media in the dissemination of the report has been documented.

Since the publication of the NCEE report, the concept of excellence has become synonomous with tougher academic requirements. Introspection about the progress of educational reforms has increased in the past 4 years. Words such as "mediocrity", "excellence", and "education at risk" have

become cliches of both the professional and lay communities. Shanker (1984a) was correct in noting that it would take 5 to 10 years before student scores could really reflect the impact of current reforms. It is too soon to determine what lasting effects A Nation at Risk will have on educational institutions, but it is not too soon to realize that the issue of educational reform has become a national, political, social, and economic priority in both the United States as a whole, and in the State of Florida in particular.

CHAPTER IV

COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDIES WITH A NATION AT RISK

Summarized in Table 4-1 (pp.124-125) are the questions addressed and the areas of comparisons and contrasts that are examined in Chapter IV.

Similarities and Differences Between the Reports in Terms of American Values During Periods of Changing Economic Milieus

A Comparison of the Participants on the Committees and How They Were Organized

Similarities and differences in method of appointment and composition of the committees

The Committee of Ten was appointed by the NEA, a national teachers' organization during a national teachers' convention. Led by Eliot, President of Harvard University, the group was comprised of leading educators with a predominance of college professionals (Krug, 1964a).

In contrast, the NCEE was created by Terrel Bell, a political appointee and United States Secretary of Education under President Reagan. Bell chartered the Commission under the Federal Advisory Committee Act and the General Education Provisions Act and chose David Gardner, President of the University of Utah, to chair the Commission. Chapter III has shown that the NCEE document was written by a business-

Table 4-1

Summary Table of Questions Addressed, and Areas of Comparisons and Contrasts Examined in Chapter IV

Question Addressed: To what extent are the NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten similar, in terms of American values in periods of changing economic milieus?

Examined Areas of Comparisons and Contrasts:

1. A Comparison of the Participants on the Committees and How the Committees Were Organized

   a. Similarities and differences in method of appointment and composition of the committees
   b. Similarities and differences in methodologies used by the committees

2. A Comparison of the Goals and Objectives of the Committees

   a. Similarities and differences in the scope of the committees
   b. Similarities and differences in the role of education in the two societies

3. A Comparison of Major Social, Political,and Economic Forces and Motivational Influences

   a. Similarities in the politically conservative orientation of the committees
   b. Similarities in the relationship between the business community and the committees

4. A Comparison of the Major Conclusions of the Reports

   a. Similarities in the committees' advocation of a common curriculum
   b. Similarities and differences in the recommended scope and sequence of the curriculum
   c. Similarities in the committees' expectations of teachers and students

Question Addressed: To what degree are the NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten similar in terms of the responses to the reports by educators and the media, state legislatures, and other related groups?

Table 4-1--continued

Examined Area of Comparisons and Contrasts:

A Comparison of How the Reports Were Received by Political and Educational Leaders, and the Media

a. Similarities and differences in responses to the reports by educators
b. Differences in the effects of the reports on educational policies
c. Similarities in major criticisms of the reports

Question Addressed: To what extent can differences and similarities betwen the NCEE report and the report of the Committee of Ten be understood in light of the models of curriculum change and development described by Zirbes (1935/1968) and Miel (1968)?

Examined Area of Comparisons and Contrasts:

A Comparison of the Similarities and Differences Between the reports in Light of the Curriculum Theories of Zirbes (1935/1968) and Miel (1968)

oriented committee of lay people and professionals, not by a group of educators motivated mainly by educational concerns.

Some of the differences in the formation and makeup of the NCEE and the Committee of Ten are products of changes which have occured in the general society over the past 90 years: The Committee of Ten was comprised of 10 male educators, 6 of whom had college affiliations (Brubacher, 1966; Doyle, 1976). The NCEE was comprised of 13 men and 5 women and included only 6 persons with college affiliations (Holton, 1984). Given the status of women in the society at large, it is unlikely that the 1892 group would have considered allowing women to play major roles on the Committee of Ten or in the subcommittees. One teacher served on the NCEE, none on the Committee of Ten. Both groups were given sizable budgets for their respective eras: $2,500 in 1892 and over $800,000 in 1981.

Similarities and differences in methodologies used by the committees

Critics have complained that the NCEE and other educational commissions convened in the early 1980s were not intended to serve as objective, fact-finding, analytical committees, but rather to dramatize the issue of educational reform (Deal 1985; Duke, 1985; Passow, 1984; Peterson, 1983). Yudof (1984) and others have suggested that the reforms of the 1980s have been shaped more by subjective, perceived feelings, than by hard data. Time constraints

prevented both the Committee of Ten and the NCEE from doing the type of in-depth studies needed to produce meaningful data.

Progress in acceptable research methodology over the past century resulted in the NCEE amassing more reliable and valid data than Eliot's committee: Described in Chapter III was the fact that over an 18 month period the NCEE commissioned papers from over 41 experts and heard testimony from students, parents, educational leaders, and lay leaders throughout the country (NCEE, 1983). Meetings were held in the 10 regional offices of the United States Department of Education, as well as at 8 meetings of the entire Commission, 2 panel discussions, and 6 public hearings. At the request of the NCEE, in excess of 200 educational organizations provided information on over 300 programs which the NCEE considered notable in nature. Appendix D of the report listed over 200 hearing and testimony participants, as well as other site visits and meetings (NCEE, 1983). Although the Commission has been criticized for not taking into account regional differences among the school systems and for not scheduling the hearings in more diverse locations (Chandler, 1983), the fact that the Commission even attempted to involve so many noneducators in their decision-making process, marks a notable contrast from the less advanced methods of investigation employed by the Committee of Ten.

Only 40 out of 200 schools contacted by the Committee of Ten responded to its survey. Only 70 of the 90 regular members originally selected agreed to serve on the nine subcommittees. The subcommittees met for 3 days, on November 9-11, 1892. The Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies included reports of the conferences held on December 28-30, 1892, where the conclusions of the subcommittees were summarized. Both committees stated their desire to achieve a geographical balance in the makeup of their groups, yet both reports responded to the needs of the major cities, especially those in the North.

Advances in communication and travel may account for the difference in the numbers of participants who contributed to the final reports of the committees. Philosophic changes concerning how decision-making committees should operate which occurred over the century must also be considered. The NCEE, as a national government-appointed body, realized that its conclusions would be disseminated quickly throughout the world by modern telecommunications. Advances in technology, coupled by the greater sophistication of educational organizational development and change theorists, are some examples of changes in the society which directly affected the operation of the Commission. The NCEE was chartered in a period where theories of management such as Ouchi's Theory Z (1983), Peters and Waterman's In Search

of Excellence (1983), and Blanchard's One Minute Manager (1983) were at the height of their popularity. It was accepted in the general society of the 1980s, that major educational decisions needed to be made with the participation of parents, students, and others. Repeatedly throughout the commission's report, reference was made to the positiveness of the reform process and the joint searching for solutions by all aspects of the lay and professional communities (NCEE, 1983, pp.12,15,16,33,36). In 1892 such participation would not have been considered. The contrast is a function of changes in social forces, rather than any difficiencies in the Committee of Ten's functioning.

A Comparison of the Goals and Objectives of the Committees

Similarities and differences in the scope of the committees' investigations

The stated goals and objectives of the NCEE were much broader in scope than those of the Committee of Ten. Whereas the Committee of Ten dealt with curriculum development in the United States, the NCEE compared educational programs in the United States with those in other countries and addressed questions concerning major educational issues related, but not limited to curriculum development.

The Committee of Ten was charged with arranging conferences for the major subject areas of the curriculum in order to discuss needed reforms in secondary school programs. Eleven questions were selected as guides for the

various subject area discussions, including questions related to the scope and sequence of the curriculum, scheduling, requirements for graduation, and methodologies of instruction and evaluation. The 11 questions were discussed in detail in Chapter II.

The main stated goal with which the NCEE was charged, to investigate the quality of education in the United States, was broken down into eight objectives. These included the following: to evaluate public and private school secondary programs; to compare curriculum, standards, and expectations in model schools with educational institutions in other countries; to compare high school standards with college admissions' requirements; to identify exemplary programs which facilitate student success on entrance exams and in the colleges; to assess the relationship between changing social and educational forces over the prior 25 years; to delineate problems following hearings, and to suggest recommendations for the implementation of reforms.

Similarities and differences in the role of education in the two societies

Both committees were set up to discuss complicated educational issues. Both assigned themselves broad objectives, though lacking any real power or authority. Although the members of each of the groups came from diverse backgrounds they were expected to reach a consensus. Holton noted (1984) that he and other members of the Commission

only accepted their appointments after Bell assured them that they would be able to issue minority reports; many of the members believed that a consensus would be impossible given the diverse backgrounds of the participants. Minority reports were not needed in the end, as the 18 members of the Commission reached complete agreement on the final report. Baker (1894) attached a dissenting report to Eliot's, criticizing the conclusions of the Committee of Ten for being too narrow in their outlook.

The broader goals and objectives of the NCEE are indicative of the major role which Gardner's commission played in the educational and political scene of the 1980s, as discussed in Chapter III. Research summarized in Chapter II showed that, in 1892, curriculum reform was an educational concern limited to the NEA and other professional educators in certain major areas of the country. It was a period where schools systems were loosely joined and where the hope for compulsory elementary education was first becoming a reality. The profession of educational administration was in its infancy. The few educational societies which existed were weak, separate entities with low membership numbers. By 1980 educational reform was a major nationwide concern of business leaders, politicians, parents, students, and educational leaders (Coleman, 1985). Professional educational associations were large, often com-

peting national groups, with professional lobbyists in federal and state governments ready to "push" educational issues. Education was no longer just the concern of the educator.

A Comparison of Major Social, Political, and Economic Forces and Motivational Influences

Similarities in the politically conservative orientation of the committees

Although Eliot and his committee were viewed by the later Progressives as having been too conservative (Krug, 1964; Ravitch, 1985; Tyack, 1967), many of them were seen by their contemporaries as being too liberal (Allmendinger, 1973; Krug, 1965; Parkinson, 1977). Doyle (1976) explained that the apparent conservative nature of the Committee of Ten has to be understood in light of the elitist, middle-class orientation of the school leadership at the end of the 19th century. In Chapters II and III the conservative orientations of both the Committee of Ten and the NCEE were explained in the context of the dominant social and political forces of their respective periods. An analysis of these forces shows some common trends.

Cochran (1972) noted that the Committee of Ten sought to create patriotic citizens who were opposed to radicalism and who were willing to take their place in society, without giving up their traditional ideals and values. The curriculum reforms suggested by Eliot´s committee thus

reinforced the traditional curriculum of the secondary schools, while adding and legitimatizing new subjects as well. The fact that the Committee, led by Eliot, Harris, and Tetlow, insisted on including modern subjects and electives in the curriculum is indicative of their liberalism during a conservative political, economic, and social period (Curti, 1966; Krug, 1965). The paradox is that "the idea of giving early and separate treatment to . . . college bound pupils became known as a `liberal´ point of view; while . . . providing the broadest possible entry for all pupils to college, became known as `conservative´" (Krug, 1964b, p.84).

The conservative climate of the 1980s has been contrasted with the liberal climate of the 1970s by several educational historians discussed in Chapter III, including Gross and Gross (1985), James and Tyack (1983), and Ravitch (1983, 1984). Presseisen (1985) and Tyler (1987) explained that the NCEE´s "back to basics´" orientation was based on its need to legitimatize traditional conservative educational philosophies during a period of rapid social change and economic recession. Bell noted (1986) that he and Reagan favored decreased federal intervention in education and increased local responsibility and were under considerable pressure from the radical right to abolish the United States department of Education. The NCEE, instead, favored

strong federal guidance over local reform initiatives (Holton, 1984). Adelson (1985), Bell (1986), Howe (1983), Lewis (1984), and others have noted that the conclusions of the NCEE report were far less conservative than President Reagan and other leading Republicans had expected. The final report did not mention the president's desire for increased parents' rights, school prayer, and tuition vouchers. Some observers believe that it was the popularity of A Nation at Risk in an election year, which prevented Republican conservatives from promoting an even more conservative educational platform that would have included drastic budget cutbacks for education (Bell, 1986; Clark, Astuto, & Rooney, 1983).

Similarities in the relationship between the business community and the committees

In Chapters II and III, the strong ties which have existed between educational leaders and the business community were documented by many sources; including Albrecht (1984), Atkin (1985), Cuban (1983), Goldberg and Harvey (1983), Odden (1984), Passow (1984), Timpane (1984), Tyler (1982, 1987), and Yeakey and Johnston (1985). At the turn of the century, Harris believed that education was important not only to meet the new technological needs of industry, but also to help keep the United States strong, preserve liberty, and prevent chaos (Harris, 1884; Welter, 1971). Angell saw and encouraged a direct, positive rela-

tionship between the business community and the public schools (Curti, 1966). Several writers inlcuding Cochran (1972), Doyle (1976), Hunt (1984), Kantor (1982), and Ravitch (1985) have explained that the NEA was under pressure from the business community to develop a more utilitarian form of secondary education which would prepare students for the new occupational requirements of industrialization.

Traditional historians saw the educational leaders at the turn of the century as humanitarians, hoping through education to alleviate the problems of the cities related to immigration and industrialization and prepare students to take their place in society. An educated citizenry was seen as being critical for strengthening a democratic society in transition (Harris,1888; Krug, 1965). The Committee of Ten stated their goal of preparing students "for their duties of life" (Mulhern, 1959, p.79) but revisionists such as Toeffler (1980) stressed that the Committee and its contemporaries were motivated by their need for social control of the immigrants. Greer (1972), Kamin (1974), Spring (1986), Toffler (1980), and others described the covert curriculum of the educators who sought the standardization of the curriculum in order to teach students punctuality and obedience. Other historians have rejected both the humanitarian and the revisionist positions and have explained that

the recommended reforms were simply practical suggestions for dealing with the specific needs of the moment.

Toffler (1980) noted that in the 1980s the goal of the educators was to prepare the students for the new information society. Several authors, including Cleveland (1986) and Spring (1984), agreed with Toffler´s premise, but noted that both the Committee of Ten and the NCEE, while hoping to provide students with skills necessary for their entry into the business world, wanted to do so without sacrificing traditional conservative values. The key was to help reform the curriculum without revolutionizing the system; to lessen civil unrest, while ensuring the dominance of sound economic principles.

The NCEE (1983) stressed in the section of the report titled, "America Can Do It" (pp.33-34), that all students would benefit from an excellent education in terms of career opportunities, as well as their improved ability to participate in the democratic process. A return to excellent schooling and a commitment to life-long learning were the overall objectives of the Commission. The NCEE explained that a "Learning Society" (NCEE, 1983, p.13) needed to be created which would include both formal and informal learning experiences. Cleveland (1986), Naisbitt (1983), and others had pointed to the need for life-long learning in a

technologically advanced society, where retraining and in-service education would be considered givens.

Increased economic competition with other nations and economic problems within the United States during the 1890s and 1980s served as a major impetus for education reform (Curti, 1966; Harris, 1884; Passow, 1984; Shimahara, 1985; Tyler, 1987; Welter, 1971). Harris noted that a proper education would allow students to have an advantage in the "international competition for markets." (Harris, 1885, p.,315). The major conclusion of the NCEE was that the United States was at risk as a result of its students growing up to be adults unable to compete with other nations in the areas of science, technology, industry, and commerce. As a result, the United States was seen to be losing its preeminence in the world. It was stressed that the mediocrity of the educational system in the United States would produce long-term problems, unless the recommenations of the NCEE were implemented (NCEE, 1983).

The Committee of Ten "cherished an egalitarian ideal of access to higher education" (Resnick, 1985, p.7). It´s hope was that by increasing the uniformity of the secondary school programs more students would be eligible for admission to colleges. In the 1890s few students went on to institutions of higher learning. Yet, in the 1980s when a college education was seen as a critical given for most high

school students, the NCEE recommendations opposed the open enrollment policies of the 1960s and 1970s. The Commission noted that it was those open enrollment policies which forced the schools, intent on keeping students in the schools at all costs, to dilute their educational requirements to minimum competencies (Brown, 1986).

A Comparison of the Major Conclusions of the Reports

Similarities in the committees' advocation of a common curriculum

A Nation at Risk was issued as an open letter to the American people and officially presented to President Reagan at a White House press conference with considerable media coverage (Holton, 1984). By September 1983, the United States Government Printing Office was into the fourth printing of the report. More than 6 million readers were said to have read over 200,000 copies of the report, published in many leading educational and non-educational sources (Phi Delta Kappa, 1983). The Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, issued in 1893, was officially presented for its first two times before the Department of Superintendence in 1894 and then to the National Council of the NEA. Thirty thousand free copies of the report were distributed by the United States Office of Education to educational leaders throughout the country.

The subcommittees of the Committee of Ten dealt with nine subject areas: Latin; Greek; math; English; other

modern languages; physical science; natural history (biology, botony, zoology, physiology); history, civil government and political economy; and geography (physical geography, geology, and meteorology). The seven specific areas covered by the NCEE were science, math and technology education, language and literacy, skills for academic learning, teaching and higher education, college admissions and the transition to postsecondary education, education for a productive role in a productive society, and education for the gifted and talented. Success was defined by both committees as being synonomous with scholastic achievement. Whereas the recommendations of the Committee of Ten centered on curriculum development and implementation, with the stated goal of helping improve the image of the United States in the world, the NCEE made specific recommendations in five general areas: content standards and expectations, time, teaching, leadership, and fiscal support.

Specific subject areas and corresponding time allotments were recommended by both committees, hoping to create a common curriculum which would provide students with a superior education. Scheduling played an important role in the reports, as did classroom management and attendance related issues. All four of the recommended curriculums outlined by the Committee of Ten included an emphasis on

English, math, and history. History was seen as a less important subject in A Nation at Risk.

Though both reports mentioned the individualized needs and interests of the students; both committees believed that there existed in each of their societies a common culture which the schools were obligated to transmit to the students via a common curriculum. This desire for a common curriculum led Eliot and his peers to negate the concept of differentiating the curriculum to meet the needs of college bound versus vocational students. Gardner and the Commission mentioned the needs of special students, but stressed that over-individualization of the curriculum had caused the lowering of standards and expectations for all students.

The common curriculum advocated by the Committee of Ten contained the nine subject areas listed above. The final report of the NCEE contained recommended curricular changes in five "new basic" content areas: English, science, social studies, math, and computer science. The Committee of Ten endorsed the principle of "equivalence of studies" (Mulhern, 1959, p.515), explaining that all disciplines were of equal value and should therefore be studied for the same period of time. Under the NCEE guidelines, high school students were required to study 4 years of English; 3 years of math, science, and social studies; and a half year of computer

science. Clearly, the NCEE did not accept the concept of the equivalence of studies.

Passow (1984) explained that the NCEE called for a more tightly defined curriculum, as compared to the popularity in the 1970s of providing students with a multitude of electives. He compared this difference in philosophy to the debate which existed between the common curriculum advocated by the Committee of Ten and the need to provide for individualized needs, as recommended by the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education in 1918. Finn (1986a) viewed professional and lay reaction to the NCEE as representing a duel between supporters of a classical education for all students and those who wanted a vocational alternative for students who did not plan to continue on to college. Both the NCEE and the Committee of Ten viewed the college-bound student as the normative pupil.

Similarities and differences in the recommended scope and sequence of the curriculums

Both the Committee of Ten and the NCEE advocated a closer articulation policy between the secondary schools and colleges and the elimination of many of the nonacademic courses from the curriculum. Students were encouraged to study fewer subjects in greater depth, thus decreasing the diversity of courses offered in secondary school programs. Although both committees objected to the number of courses being offered to high school students, differences in size

and the complexities of the school systems in the two periods must be mentioned. Ravitch (1985, p.137) noted that the Committee of Ten objected that 36 different subjects were being taught in 40 secondary schools throughout the United States. By 1977 there were 2,100 separate high school, mostly nonacademic courses being taught in 741 schools in Illinois alone.

Similarities in the committees´ expectations of teachers and students

The Committee of Ten advocated improving teacher preparation programs in order to train teachers who would be better able to facilitate the instruction of their students through improved teaching methods (Cohen, 1974). The NCEE found teacher training programs to be inadequate and the conditions under which teachers worked to be "unacceptable" (NCEE 1983, p.22; Trow, 1985). Seven subsequent recommendations were made by the NCEE with the stated intent of making the teaching profession more respected by the community and rewarding for the professionals. Both reports indicated that teachers could make a tremendous difference in the quality of their student´s education.

Both reports contained suggestions for improved methods of evaluation for assessing the curriculum and the progress of the students. The NCEE further recommended that textbooks be upgraded and that new instructional materials be chosen more carefully. It would have been impossible for the Com-

mittee of Ten to imagine the great numbers of books, workbooks, teaching aids, and audio visual equipment used in secondary school programs today.

The need to introduce certain subjects to students at an earlier age was recommended by both the NCEE and the Committee of Ten, with the scope of the material to be increased in the later years of schooling. The authors of both reform proposals concurred in their desire to have teachers of the lower classes raise the level of scholarship within their schools and their expectations regarding the capabilities of their students. It was stressed that all students in all schools had the right to the same quality education, taught by qualified instructors. Clearly, equality of educational opportunity had a different meaning in the post-Reconstruction era than it did in the 1980s, following desegregation and busing.

Eliot (1905), in his response to criticism by Hall that the Committee of Ten was creating unreasonably high standards in the secondary schools, noted that American educators tended to expect less from their students than Europeans did. Research by the NCEE showed that greater numbers of students in the United States were found to be illiterate and weaker in the math and science areas than their counterparts in other areas of the world. American students were said to spend less time on their school work,

both in terms of numbers of hours per day and number of days per year of attendance, than in other democratic nations (Passow, 1984).

Similarities and Differences in Responses to the Reports

Similarities and Differences in the Reactions to the Reports by Educators

Differences in the reactions to the 1890 the 1983 reports were to a great extent due to technological differences in communication capabilites in the two societies. The issue of compulsory schooling was still not accepted in certain areas of the country at the end of the 19th century. School reform was more of an intellectual discussion among the educational leaders. In the 1980s following the publishing of A Nation At Risk, school reform seemed to be advocated by everyone, from the student to the government leader (Education Commission of the States, 1984).

Pipho noted (1985b) that a major difference between reaction to A Nation at Risk and prior reports was that in the 1980s communication between educational leaders and politicians throughout the country was excellent. Pipho explained that the educational reform process changed with the publication of the NCEE report. Legislatures in different parts of the country were motivated to act, based on media reports of successes and failures in other sections of the country. Reforms were initiated on a state level and

then filtered down to the schools. Increased brainstorming in the various political and educational sectors, publicized by modernized telecommunication systems, increased the numbers of attempted reforms. However, because the change process was often initiated on a state level, rather than at the school board or site level, intimidated teachers and administrators often fought against the reforms.

The Committee of Ten published a reform report which received support from many contemporary teachers and school personnel, especially in the North. The NCEE document met with more resistance from cohesive groups of well-informed educators (Chandler, 1983; Holton, 1984). Holton noted (1984) that from the inception of the Commission he and others worried that the composition of the Commission would be problematic and that professional teachers' organizations would be alienated by their lack of adequate representation.

Eliot's committee recognized that not all schools in all parts of the country would be willing to implement its recommended reforms. It can be inferred that the Committee of Ten report was virtually ignored by the southern states from the fact that the Committee of Ten is not even mentioned in most books describing the history of education in the South during the second half of the 19th century (Dabney, 1969; Kandel, 1924; Knight, 1951; Shofner, 1974; Williamson, 1976).

Finn (1985a) cited three differences between the reforms begun in 1983 and earlier reforms: The NCEE was interested in cognitive outcomes, as opposed to changes in school processes or organization. The reform movement was more decentralized than earlier efforts, with the federal government playing a minor role. For the first time lay leaders, including politicians and business experts, were at the forefront of the proposed changes. "The education profession . . . is not part of the excellence movement. The profession did not initiate it, is not leading it, and . . . is opposing key elements of it" (Finn, 1985a, p.64). The primary responsibility for carrying out the NCEE reforms was assigned to local levels of government, though the federal government was held accountable for coordinating and helping to facilitate the changes (Holton, 1984).

Tyack noted (1974) that the Committee of Ten report was also used by school boards and state legislatures at the turn of the century to legitimize reforms. In fact, in 1905 Hall objected to the top-down implementation of the Committee of Ten reform proposals, suggesting that many teachers and administrators would ignore the recommendations because of their lack of involvement in the change process. Although the NCEE has been criticized for not seeking to involve the teachers more in the change process and for castigating the teaching profession for its ineptness

(Atkin, 1985; Boyer, 1984; Block, 1983; Brown, 1986; Doyle and Hartle, 1985b; Finn, 1986b; Goodlad, 1983; Gross and Gross, 1985; Symposium, 1984; Shanker, 1985; Tye and Tye, 1984), the Commission did caution against viewing teachers as scapegoats. Gardner and his committee further lauded teacher professional organizations for their commitment to curricular reform and development. However, according to the findings of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company's survey of teachers (1985), in states where reforms had been implemented, teachers were more likely to see the reforms as being negative and many were seriously thinking of leaving the teaching profession.

Differences in the effects of the reports on educational policies

Both the Committee of Ten and the NCEE were instrumental in bringing the issue of education before the American public (Doyle, 1976). Research documented in Chapter III showed that public and professional reactions to A Nation at Risk were faster and more intense than to any other educational reform report (Odden, 1986). Chapter III also included descriptions of some of the educational conferences, legislative sessions, and task forces which were facilitated, if not directly as a result of A Nation at Risk, then as a result of the climate favorable to educational reform, which followed the publication of the commission's report (Pipho, 1986c).

The explosion of educational reforms on state and local levels continued for several years following the release of the NCEE report (e.g., Clark, Astuto, & Rooney, 1983; Ginsberg & Wimpelberg, 1985; Goldberg & Harvey, 1983; Gordon, 1983; Pipho, 1983; Ravitch, 1985; Reagan, 1984; Yeakay & Johnston, 1985). The Education Commission of the States reviewed the reform proposals of 46 states in 1984. Pipho (1986a, 1986c) reported that between 200 and 300 state-level task forces had been convened since 1983, resulting in changes in graduation requirements in 40 states, and examination of the question of career ladders in more than 30 states. By 1986, teachers were required to be tested before certification for the first time, in over 50% of the states.

Harris stated that the curricula recommended by the Committee of Ten served as a blueprint for high schools into the 20th century (Perkinson, 1977). Many historians, including Krug (1964), Meyer (1969), and Tyack (1967), noted that the Committee helped create a climate favorable for educational change, which facilitated changes in the secondary school classrooms. Although the proposals were not adopted at the time, many of the recommendations of Eliot's committee later influenced reform efforts (Brubacher, 1966; Doyle, 1976; Hunkins, 1976; Ravitch, 1985; Tyack, 1967). Ravitch explained (1985) that the specific reforms of the Committee of Ten were not lasting, in part because they

conflicted with the emerging philosophy of the younger professional educators at the turn of the century. Supporters of increased local control of the schools opposed the centralization tendencies of the Committee of Ten report. Pipho concluded, in 1985, that future reform efforts would have to take into serious account the change process and organizational development.

Similarities in major criticisms of the reports

Both the Committee of Ten and the NCEE were accused of being unresponsive to the individual needs of the students. Both committees denied the charges to an extent: Eliot in his lecture on "Undesirable and Desirable Uniformity in the Schools" (Perkinson, 1977), explained that desirable uniformity would result within a given subject area so that anyone studying that subject would cover it in the same manner for the same amount of time. Undersirable uniformity would result from the creation of a single curriculum in a school, which would preclude students from having any choices in what they studied. Baker´s dissenting report was based on his disapproval of allowing students latitude in choosing electives, a policy advocated by Eliot and the rest of the Committee of Ten. Baker and other more conservative educators desired all students to study identical subjects in all schools (Good, 1970). Harris supported Eliot´s concept of

electives, but was opposed to individualized instruction, favoring instead class recitation exercises (Cohen, 1974).

Hall (1905) criticized Eliot and the Committee for failing to deal with the "incapables" (p.49) within the secondary schools. Eliot responded (1905) that although he believed that individualized instruction was important, principals needed to meet the needs of whole classes not individuals. Eliot explained to Hall that, in his opinion, holding back capable students was more of an injustice than pushing the "incapables". The NCEE stressed that all students were capable of learning and that the expectations and standards for all should be raised. Insisting that equity and equality were twin goals (NCEE, 1983, pp.12, 13, 15, 24, 28, 29, 32), the NCEE made specific curricular recommenations for gifted and disadvantaged students in each section of their report. However, as was discussed in Chapter III, the emphasis in A Nation at Risk was clearly on the talented student.

Many critics of A Nation at Risk, including Albrecht (1984), Best (1984), Cardenas and First (1985), Goodlad (1983), Goodman (1984), Woodring (1983), and Yeakay and Johnston (1985), feared that the implementation of the NCEE recommendations would result in an increased number of high school dropouts in the United States. Robinson warned Eliot in 1894 that the Committee of Ten report was too

theoretical, and that students were being sufficiently challenged in existing secondary school programs. Robinson argued that stipulating additional requirements and a more intense program of study, would increase the burden on especially the college-bound student. He was concerned that ultimately, the Committee of Ten report might result in fewer students completing their secondary studies and continuing on to colleges, the opposite of what the Committee intended.

Both reports were criticized for lacking provisions for specialty subjects such as physical education and the fine arts. Eliot expressed his disappointment at their exclusion from the recommended curriculum, but noted that a major objective of the Committee was to decrease the number of electives, while legitimizing certain modern subjects and creating a more uniform curriculum in all schools (Krug, 1965). Suggestions for foreign language study, the arts, and vocational study were included in the NCEE report, and the Commission did express several times its concern for humanitarian subjects. However, the NCEE did not provide details as to how its recommendations should be financed, or where additional support personnel and time for study would be found for those curricular "frills".

Similarities and Differences Between the Reports in Light of the Curriculum Theories of Zirbes and Miel

Zirbes (1935/1968) separated curriculum reform into two main categories--traditional versus progressive. A traditional curriculum included an emphasis on basic subject matter and learning skills; books, scheduling, organization, and mastery of content; and prescribed and controlled learning environments, including mass teaching and question and answer recitation. It has been shown in Chapters II and III that all of these traditional elements were present in the recommendations of the Committee of Ten and the NCEE.

Though both reform proposals mentioned the individual needs of pupils, both committees advocated reforms which would facilitate the transmission of democratic ideals via a common curriculum. The model curriculums of the Committee of Ten included traditional areas, though adding certain modern subjects. Gardner's commission mentioned the needs of special students, but stressed that it was the over-individualization of the curriculum that had caused the lowering of standards and expectations for all students.

Comparisons between the two reform proposals contained in Chapter IV can be summarized in that both reports are conservative documents, reflecting a redirection of educational institutions during periods of major economic transformations. The comparisons seem to show that the Committee of Ten and the NCEE reports both advocate movement

to a traditional curriculum from progessive periods, as defined by Zirbes (1935/1968).

Miel (1968) argued that it is erroneous to see the inclusion of traditional items, such as those described by Zirbes (1935/1968) as a negation of everything progessive. As shown in Chapters II and III and in the comparisons of the reform proposals in Chapter IV, neither committee was as conservative as many of their contemporaries would have preferred. Miel rejected the concept of an either-or curriculum model, where curriculum designs are completely rejected and replaced by curriculum innovations. She compared this erroneous concept of curriculum development to educational reforms, swinging back and forth, as if on a pendulum locked into set grooves. Instead Miel supported the concept of an upward and outward "spiral curriculum" (Miel, 1968, p.156). As described in Chapter I, her model allowed for the possibility that curriculum designers learn from past attempts at curricular reform. They could return to curriculum designs attempted in the past and adapt them to fit contemporary situations. The old curriculum design, graced with the passage of time and changes in social, political, economic, and educational forces, becomes transformed by the curriculum specialist into a new solution to a new problem.

As shown in Chapter IV many comparisons can be made between the Report of the Committee on Secondary School

Studies, and A Nation at Risk. Contrasts between the committees and the reform proposals have been explained as resulting from changes in social, political, economic, and educational forces which occurred over the century. The recommendations are similar in essence, but not identical. The greater sophistication of the NCEE recommendations may reflect what Miel referred to as a "refinement" of the "back to basics" curricular design; which can be traced back at least to the Committee of Ten. The NCEE report appears to contain many of the same elements as the Committee of Ten's proposal, combined with "wisdom distilled from experience at both sides of the spiral" (Miel, 1968, p.156).

Summary

The Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies and A Nation at Risk have been compared and contrasted in Chapter IV to analyze to what extent they are similar in terms of American values during periods of changing economic milieus and in terms of responses to them by educators, the media, and other related groups. The similarities and differences that were found were then considered in light of the models of curriculum change and development described by Zirbes (1935/1968) and Miel (1968). In order to better compare and contrast them, the two reform proposals were discussed in terms of the formation of the committees and

their stated goals; motivational factors and major social, economic, and political forces which may have influenced them; major conclusions that were reached; reaction to the documents by political, governmental, and educational leaders, as well as the media; and the effects which the Committee of Ten and the NCEE had on the development of policies for educational institutions in the United States.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Continuity of Curricular Change

In this study the reports of the NCEE and the Committee of Ten were compared and contrasted to consider to what degree these two major American reform proposals reflect elements of change and continuity. Similarities between the reports were analyzed in terms of the organization of the committees, their participants, and philosophies and goals; the content and major conclusions of the reports; major social forces and possible motivational factors; responses to the proposals by educators, the media, state legislatures, and other groups; and the effect of the reports on the development of educational policies for the schools.

Secretary of Education Bennett noted that curriculum fundamentals, which were important to Thomas Jefferson 200 years ago, are still of fundamental importance in the United States today (cited in Senese, 1985). The detailed analysis (in Chapter IV) showed that certain conservative goals and values remained constant over the century. Some of the underlying themes which appeared in both reports included accepting the college-bound student as the normative student

and refusing to differentiate the curriculum for vocational pupils, improving teacher training programs, tightening the organization of the institutions, improving scheduling and time on task, instituting tougher requirements for graduation, introducing certain subjects to students at an earlier age, increasing the articulation between the requirements of the secondary schools and the admission policies of the colleges, raising standards and expectations for all students, and improving methods of evaluation and assessment for both students and the curriculum. Philosophically, both proposals accepted the beneficience of schools as institutions which prepare students to take their places in society through a common curriculum. Schools were portrayed by the Committee of Ten and the NCEE as bastions of democracy, patriotism, and upward mobility (see Table 5-1, p.158).

"The history of educational reform is not encouraging, but perhaps this time things will be different." (Passow, 1984, p.683). Humanitarian, revisionist, and practical revisionist educational historians agree on the importance of analyzing the past in order to better plan for the future. Cremin (1961), Cuban (1979), Katz (1971), and Miel (1968) have stressed that meaningful educational changes are unlikely to happen without curriculum reformers first analyzing the historical roots of current problems. All four examined the reform process over the past century and

Table 5-1

Elements of Continuity Found in the Reports of the Committee of Ten and the NCEE

Both committees advocated

1. conservative goals and values
2. schools serving as bastions of democracy and patriotism
3. modernizing the curriculum to meet changing needs
4. strengthening the symbiotic relationship between the educational and the business community
5. implementing curricular reforms in a top-down manner with little local input
6. viewing the college-bound student as the normative student
7. creating a common curriculum for all students whether or not college bound
8. improving organization of the institutions
9. introducing certain subjects to students at earlier ages
10. improving scheduling within the schools and increased time on task by the students
11. raising standards and expectations for graduation
12. toughening requirements for graduation
13. increasing the articulation between graduation requirements and college entrance requirements
14. improving methods of student assessment
15. improving methods of curriculum evaluation
16. improving teacher training programs

concluded that little has changed in the past 100 years in terms of educational objectives and what the schools have achieved and have failed to achieve. The conservative goal of socializing the student has remained constant and has added to the stability of the curriculum. To the extent that there appears to be continuity in many of the problems and solutions considered by the Committee of Ten and the NCEE, this thesis of curriculum stability has been confirmed by this study.

Besides the common themes in the two reform proposals, the similarities in the criticisms to the reports are startling. In the 1890s and 1980s critics objected to the top-down nature of the proposed reforms and the exclusion of certain "frills" such as art and physical education from the curriculum. Critics warned that increased standards and requirements might lead to more students dropping out, as their individual needs ceased to be met.

Redirection of Educational Institutions During Periods of Economic Transformation

The similarities in themes between the reports reflect the return in each era to a traditional, conservative curriculum as defined by Zirbes (1935/1968). During both periods educational policies were directly influenced by non-educators, usually business and/or political leaders, who believed that the schools could mitigate basic problems in their respective society. The differences in the

proposals are to a large extent the result of changes in social, political, economic, and educational forces over the past century. This study has shown that the curriculum recommended by the NCEE combines the changing forces of the 1980s with the traditional common curriculum advocated by the Committee of Ten, thus demonstrating Miel's (1968) theory of a spiral curriculum.

Dewey believed in examining society's "givens" and developing a philosophy to meet those givens (Dewey, 1969). This study has shown that A Nation at Risk and Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies, each in its own era, reflects a redirection of educational institutions and curriculum development during periods of economic transformation. The primary sources which were investigated have demonstrated that the political, economic, and social givens in each repective period appeared to each of the committees to be in states of flux, as a result of changing social forces. Both committees, in developing their philosophies and objectives, as well as in the development of their curriculum, tried to assess the needs of the society as a whole. In so doing, the committee members clarified and redefined the philosophy and objectives of the educational institutions to meet the committee members' perceptions of their society's needs.

The Committee of Ten report was written during the rise of the industrial revolution, when immigration and urbanization were major issues facing educational, political, and business leaders. Eliot and his committee were charged by the NEA with the task of conceptualizing reforms for the secondary schools by analyzing each subject area and by so doing, to reevaluate the purpose of the schools. It is clear that the function of the Committee of Ten was not to suggest the implementation of radical reforms, but to help modernize the curriculum and bring it more in line with changing social forces. Sizer (1964) noted that Eliot´s report became obsolete as a result of cultural and social changes in society.

The NCEE was chartered by a conservative president and his staff during the nation´s transitional period from an industrial to a highly technological, information-based era (Cleveland, 1986; Naisbitt, 1982; Ravitch, 1983, 1984, 1985; Toffler, 1980). The Commission was charged with evaluating the educational process in public and private secondary schools and making practical recommendations for the implementation of curricular reforms. The goal was to investigate the quality of education in the United States in comparison to other industrialized nations, in order to educate students who would be able as adults to strengthen our economic position in competitive markets. Given

President Reagan's conservative views on tuition vouchers, tax credits for parents of private school students, and school prayer, there is little doubt that Holton (1984), Bell (1986), and Wimpelberg and Ginsberg (1985) were correct in their understanding that the NCEE was chartered to legitimatize the Republican party's educational platform. This study has shown that the Committee of Ten and the NCEE produced reform proposals that, while conservative in nature, where not nearly as conservative as some of their contemporaries had wished.

In compiling their reports, the Committee of Ten and the NCEE reflected their understanding of the changing needs of students to fit into their respective societies as productive adults. Their recommendations appear to have been motivated by humanitarian, practical, and social control concerns. The strong relationship between the educational and the business community has been demonstrated, as has the the influence of business leaders on both proposals.

Implications for Future Curriculum Development and Reform

The Next Curriculum Swing?

The researcher has analyzed the reports of the Committee of Ten and the NCEE in light of the curriculum development theories of Zirbes (1935/1968) and Miel (1968). The two authors noted that throughout the history of curriculum development each traditional period was followed by a more

progressive one. If they are correct then the implication is that shortly the pendulum will again swing from the excellence oriented, "back to basics" curriculum of the NCEE to a more progressive model which will again stress the individual needs of the students.

Odden (1984) noted that the reform reports of the early 1980s brought with their publication a hope of renewed economic growth. It is possible that the shattering of those hopes began with the stock market crash of 1987. If Tyler (1982, 1987) is correct that educational reform periods in the United States have generally resulted from economic recessions, then the next reform period may not be that far away. The implication from Miel's theory is that the new curricular recommendations will not be identical to the progressive, child-centered curriculum of the 1970s or 1920s, but will combine that type of a curriuclum, with the changing forces of the 1990s.

The Need for More Analytical Studies of Past Curriculum Reform Efforts

Bellack (1969) accused curriculum planners of constantly reinventing the wheel--seeing each problem as a new problem requiring a new solution. The main implication from this study for education in general is that more historical studies of curriculum development are needed. Curriculum reformers need to learn more about prior successful and unsuccessful efforts at specific curricular

reforms and to combine this knowledge with theories of change and organizational development. This study has shown that both conservative and revisionist educational historians agree on the importance of analyzing the past in order to better plan for the future (Cremin, 1961; Katz, 1971; Miel, 1968; Reitzel & Lindemann, 1982; Yudof, 1984). Failing to learn from prior efforts at similar curricular reform results in wastes of time, energy, and fiscal resources. It may be conjectured that given the similarities between the documents, an analysis of the Committee of Ten report, and especially its major criticisms, by the NCEE might have resulted in changes in some of the final recommendations.

The Need to Create a Learning Society

Duke (1985) noted that the NCEE and other reform proposals of the early 1980s placed too great an emphasis on the "outputs" of education, versus the "throughputs" and "inputs" (p.673). In the researcher's judgment, one of the most important recommendations of the NCEE was its emphasis on the need to create a learning society where lifelong learning will be seen as a given. The need for such a learning society which could include formal and informal learning experiences has been documented by many futurists, including Cleveland (1986), Naisbitt (1982), Toffler (1980).

The Need for Further Research on the Roles of Parents, Students, and Teachers in the Curricular Reform Process

Cohen (cited in Symposium, 1984), Hacker (1984), and Sedlak et al. (1985) faulted the NCEE for failing to research the degree to which students have distanced themselves from the educational process and the social interactions between faculty and students. These issues must be dealt with if future reform efforts are to succeed. Change theory has shown the importance of including all members of a community in the decision-making process (Bennis, Benne, Chin, & Corey, 1976). Reform efforts must involve not just lay and educational leaders, but parents and students as well. Such involvement will clearly be more effective if attempted on a local rather than national level.

Change and stability in an institution have been shown to be a result of the day to day realities of schools. Serious consideration needs to be given to alternative methods of funding educational reforms and methods of retaining teachers within the system. Improved teacher training programs will not mitigate problems in the schools, if teachers continue to leave the profession due to unsatisfactory working conditions or move into administration positions to achieve higher status and salaries. Change theory suggests that reforms can not be legislated unless the key participants in the implementation, the parents, teachers, and students, feel ownership of the changes.

The Need for More Localized Curricular Reform Efforts

Cuban (1979) noted that the isolated nature of teaching makes teachers wary and conservative when it comes to implementing reforms in their classrooms. It appears that decentralized reform efforts, where teachers are involved in the decision-making process and the curriculum reforms are designed to meet the specific needs of students in specific situations, will be more likely to succeed than the reform efforts of either the Committee of Ten or the NCEE. Leaders at the national and state levels should only recommend and guide the educational change process, not dictate it. More research is needed to compare decentralized and centralized reform efforts to consider differences in the speed and scope of implementation and which ones result in more lasting changes.

The Need to Reassess the Goals of our School System and the Function of Education in the United States

Albrecht (1984) accused the NCEE of planting "seeds of mischief" (p.684) by the tone of urgency inherent in their conclusions. Media "hype" related to the publication of the NCEE report and subsequent legislative efforts at reform have turned the phrase "educational excellence" into a cliche. Ravitch (1985) described the history of educational reform as a pendulum swinging from "public apathy to intense concern" (p.5). There is the danger that as the unrealistic goals are not met by the institutions, disenchantment

with the schools and teachers will increase. Disillusioned citizens may point to the monies and efforts poured into the reforms of the 1980s in disgust and be less likely to support major educational reform efforts in the future. This scenario underlines the importance for educators to seize the moment and develop realistic recommendations for reforms that can work.

Finn (1984) and Hawkins (1985) explained that the widening chasm between educational realities and what citizens want from the schools makes the need for educational reforms more immediate. Sarason (1983) warned that hasty reforms appear to be implemented throughout the history of education as fads, as the schools became the scapegoats for the problems of society. More historical studies would enable educational and lay leaders to distinguish between fads and meaningful reform suggestions. It appears that society has developed unrealistic goals as to what schools can accomplish, and that reform efforts will fail unless schools either reevaluate their purpose, or change their structure to include areas such as increased family education programs.

Both the Committee of Ten and the NCEE saw schools as major institutions which would prepare students for their roles in society. As family structures have deteriorated, parents have come to expect schools to fulfill new quasi-

parental roles including teaching students subjects such as sex and AIDS education. Curriculum designers must consider the importance of subjects such as these in preparing students for life in modern America. However, educators need to be more realistic about how much can be taught given the normative length of the school day and school year. New priorities need to be established that meet the needs of the students, without allowing parents to abdicate their responsibilities. In the researcher's judgment, schools, especially outside of major metropolitan areas, need to increase the scope of their programs to service the needs of the students and their families. Better use needs to be made of school facilities by increasing their usage in evenings, weekends, and summer months.

General Implications for the State of Florida

A Miami Herald article on December 30, 1987, reported that the population of the state of Florida increased by 23% during the 1980s, making it the fourth most populated state in the nation. It is critical for the social and economic growth of Florida that care be taken in the implementation of the recommendations of the NCEE. In 1985, then Florida Commissioner of Education Turlington outlined his objectives designed to move Florida by 1989 into the upper quartile for educational achievement in the United States and make it into a "State of Educational Distinction". Whether these

objectives and the 10 goals for the educational system which Turlington announced in 1986 can be met remains to be seen. Studies need to be done to examine the successes and failures of the reform efforts in Florida and to apply theories of organizational change and development to proposed reforms for the future.

Miles (1964) noted that intrasystem tension is inevitable in the educational change process. The resulting power struggle becomes more important to the change agents and the defenders of the status quo than the innovations. Educational and lay leaders in Florida need to consider the specific social forces which will effect any attempts at change. Gary (1980) and English (1980) stressed the importance of understanding the culture and background of the people who will be effected by curriculum reform. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Foshay, 1980) concluded that curriculum change can best be accomplished if the designers of the reforms recognize the community's "zone of tolerance" (p.147). The Florida legislature needs to contemplate how reforms that they are suggesting will effect the child who recently arrived from Cuba or Haiti to Miami, as well as the fifth generation American child living comfortably in Duval County. Raising standards and expectations to achieve excellence is justifiable as

long as the process does not perpetuate inequalities and class distinctions.

Chapter III of this study documented some of the reforms implemented in Florida since 1983, noting that Florida was recognized as having made some of the most extensive educational reforms in the country under Governor Robert Graham. The repeal of the Florida services tax in 1987 has raised serious questions as to the continued successful funding of many of these reforms. It is too soon to tell how much of a lasting effect the recommendations of the NCEE will have locally. The tougher standards, requirements, and evaluation programs which resulted from the implementation of the RAISE bill (1983), the PRIME program, and the FACET act (Turlington, 1986) have contributed to Florida having one of the highest dropout rate in the country (Bondi & Wiles, 1986). Whether this is a long-term or short-term phenomenon remains to be seen.

This study has shown that changing social, economic, and political forces must be considered, as well as educational realities when planning curriculum changes. Educational excellence is both a necessity and a viable possibility in the State of Florida. Many non-educators influence reform proposals, but the successful implementation of curiculum changes depends on creating a

synergy between parents, teachers, and students who feel ownership of the reforms.

REFERENCES

Adelson, J. (1985). Four surprises, or why the schools may not improve much. In J.H. Bunzel (Ed.), The challenge to American schools: The case for standards and values (pp. 17-28). New York: Oxford University Press.

Adler, J. M. (1982). The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan.

Albrecht, J. E. (1984). A Nation At Risk: Another view. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 684-685.

Albrecht, J.E., & Duea, J. (1983). What price excellence? The Iowa experience. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 211-213.

Allmendinger, D.F. (1973). Strong men of the academic revolution. History of Education Quarterly, 13, 415-426.

American Association of School Administrators. (1983). The cost of reform: Fiscal implications of "A Nation At Risk". Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

American Philological Association. (1894). Address of the Committee of Twelve. School Review, 2, 432-450.

Angell, J.R. (1970). American education: Addresses and articles (Essay Index Reprint Series). New York: Books for Libraries Press.

Anrig, G.R. (1986). Schools and higer education in a period of reform. National Forum, 66 (2), 83-129.

Antonalli, G.A. (1984, January). Barriers to educational excellence. Education Digest, p. 18.

Atkin, J.M. (1985). Changing our thinking about educational change. In J.H. Bunzel (Ed.), The challenge to American schools: The case for standards and values (pp. 47-60). New York: Oxford University Press.

Augier, F.R., & Gordon, S.C. (Eds.).(1973). Sources of West India history (3rd ed.). London: Longmans.

Bailyn, B. (1960). Education in the formation of American society: Needs and Opportunities for Study. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Baker, E.L. (1984). Can educational research inform educational practice? Yes!. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 453-455.

Baker, J. (1894). Review of the report of the Committee of Ten. National Education Association Proceedings of 1894, 645-669.

Bell, T. (1966). Government by commission. Public Interest, 3(1), 3-9.

Bell, T. (1983, December 8). Suggested priorities and goals for American education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Forum on Excellence in Education, Indianapolis, IN.

Bell, T. (1984). American education at a crossroads. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 531-534.

Bell, T. (1986). Education policy development in the Reagan administration. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 487-493.

Bellack, A. (1969). History of curriculum thought and practice. Education Research, 39, 283-292.

Bennis, W. G., Benne, K.D., Chin, R., & Corey, K. (Eds.). (1976). The Planning of change (3rd ed.). New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Berelson, B. (1952). Content analysis in communication research. New York: Hafner.

Best, J.H. (1984). Reforming America´s schools: The high risks of failure. Teachers College Record, 86, 265-274.

Beyer, L.E. (1985). Educational reform: The political roots of national risk. Curriculum Inquiry, 15 (1), 37-56.

Blanchard, K. (1982). The one minute manager. New York: William Morrow.

Bloch, M. (1964). The historian´s craft. New York: Vantage Books.

Block, J. (1971). Understanding historical research: A search for truth. Glen Rock, NJ: Dubby Research.

Block, R. (1983). We already know our problems out here in the field. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 183.

Bondi, J. & Wiles, J. (1986). School reform in Florida: Implications for the Middle School. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 44-46.

Borg, W. & Gall, M. (1971). Educational research: An introduction (2nd. ed.). New York: David McKay.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1984). Reflections on the great debate of `83. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 525-530.

Breckenridge, P. (1984). Florida school chief calls for slowdown of state reform efforts. Education Week, 3(36) 7, 34.

Bridgman, A. (1985). States launching barrage of initiatives, survey finds. Education Week, 4(21), 1, 31.

Brown, L.D. (1986). A multitude of perspectives on the latest "Great Debate" in education. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 615-620.

Brubacher, J.S. (1966). A history of the problems of education (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bunzel, J. H. (Ed.). (1985). The challenge to American schools: The case for standards and values. New York: Oxford University Press.

Butts, R. F. (1955). A cultural history of western education: Its social and intellectual foundations (2nd. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the culture of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, A. (1981). Girl delinquents. New York: St. Martins Press.

Campbell, A. (1984). The girls in the gang: A report from New York City. New York: B. Blackwell.

Campbell, D. T. (1975). Degrees of freedom and the case study. Comparative Political Studies, 8, 178-193.

Cardenas, J., & First, J.M. (1985). Children at Risk. Educational Leadership, 43(1), 4-8.

Carnoy, M. (1974).Education as cultural imperialism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Carnoy, M. (1983). Education, democracy and social conflict. Harvard Education Review, 53, 398-402.

Chandler, H.W. (1983). Just among us teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 181-183.

Clark, D., Astuto, T., & P. Rooney. (1983). The changing structure of federal education policy in the 1980s. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 188-193.

Clement, J.P. (1983). "A Nation At Risk": At best, a C+. Independent School, 43(1), 19-22.

Cleveland, H. (1986). Educating citizens and leaders for an information-based society. Educational Leadership, 43(6), 62-64.

Cochran, T.C. (1972). Business in American life: A history. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cochran, T.C. (1977). Two hundred years of American business. New York: Basic Books.

Cohen, S. (Ed.). (1974). Education in the United States: A documentary history (Vol. 3). New York: Random House.

Coleman, J.S. (1985). International comparisons of cognitive achievement. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 403-406.

Commissioner of Education. (1893). Report for the year 1889-1890 (Vol. II). Washington, DC: Bureau of Education. In E. Krug (Ed.), (1965). Charles W. Eliot and popular education (pp.23-24). New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University.

Concise Oxford dictionary of current English (6th ed.). (1976). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1961). Transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1876-1957. New York: Knopf.

Cremin, L.A. (1971). Curriculum-making in the United States. Teachers College Record, 73, 207-220.

Cremin, L.A. (1977). Traditions of American education. New York: Basic Books.

Cuban, L. (1979). Determinants of curriculum change and stability, 1870-1970. In J. Schaffarzick and G. Sykes, (Eds.), Value conflicts and curriculum issues (139-196). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Cuban, L. (1983). Corporate involvement in public schools: A practitioner-academic's perspective. Teachers College Record, 85, 183-195.

Curti, M. (1966). The social ideas of American educators. (rev. ed.). Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams.

Dabney, C.W. (1969). American education: It's men, ideas and institutions (Vol.2). New York: Arno Press.

Danzger, M.H. (1982). The use of newspapers. In R. Smith & P. Manning (Eds.), A handbook of social science methods (Vol.2, pp. 197-218). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Deal, T. (1985). National commissions: Blueprints for remodeling our ceremonies for revitalizing public schools. Education and Urban Society, 17(2), 145-156.

Dewey, J. (1956). The child and the curriculum and the school and society (rev. ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1966). Democracy and education (rev. ed.). New York: The First Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1969). Education today (rev. ed. Foreward by Joseph Ratner). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Dominick, J.R. (1984, December). Education as portrayed in television newscasts. Education Digest, pp. 14-20.

Doyle, D.P., & Hartle, T.W. (1985a). Excellence in education: The states take charge. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Doyle, D.P., & Hartle, T.W. (1985b). Leadership in education: Governors, legislators and teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 21-24.

Doyle, W. (1976). Education for all: The triumph of professionalism. In O.L. Davis (Ed.), Perspectives on curriculum development 1776-1976 (pp. 17-75). Washington DC: American Society for Curriculum Development.

Duke, D. D. (1985). What is the nature of educational excellence and should we try to measure it? Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 671-674.

Dunkel, H. (1973). W. T. Harris and Hegelianism in American education. School Review, 81, 233-245.

Eckstein, H. (1975). Case study and theory in political science. In F.I. Greenstein & N.W. Polsby (Eds.), Strategies of inquiry (pp.70-137). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Edgar, E., & Billingsley, F. (1974). Believability when N = 1 The Psychological Record, 24, 147-160.

Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1984). Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Eliot, C.W. (1869a). New education. The Atlantic Monthly, 23, 203-220; 358-367.

Eliot, C.W. (1869b). Charles W. Eliot's innaugural address as President of Harvard. In S. Cohen (Ed.), (1974). Education in the United States: A documentary history Vol.3, pp.1546-1554). New York: Random House.

Eliot, C.W. (1885). Liberty in education. In S. Cohen (Ed)., (1974). Education in the United States: A documentary history (Vol.3, pp.1554-1563). New York: Random House.

Eliot, C.W. (1892). Can school programs be shortened and enriched. In S. Cohen (Ed.). (1974)., Education in the United States: A documentary history (Vol. 3, pp.1926-1930). New York: Random House.

Eliot, C.W. (1905). The fundamental assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten. Educational Review, 30, 325-343.

Eliot, C. W. (1911). Introduction. In H. Spencer. (1977). Essays on education (reprint). New York: AMS Press.

Eliot, C.W. (1967). The conflict between individualism and collectivism in a democracy: Three lectures (reprint). Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press.

Eliot, C.W. (1969a). Harvard memories (reprint). Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press.

Eliot, C.W. (1969b). The durable satisfactions of life (reprint). Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press.

Eliot, C.W. (1970). The training for effective life (reprint). Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press.

Eliot, C.W. (1971). A late harvest: Miscellaneous papers written between eighty and ninety (reprint). Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press.

Evans, C. (1980). The micro millennium. New York: Viking Press.

Fernandez, E. (1985, January). Nation at odds--Better description than Nation at risk. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 49-55.

Finn, C.E. (1984). The excellence backlash: Sources of resistance to educational reform. The American Spectator, 17, (9), 10-16.

Finn, C. E. (1985a). The dilemmas of educational excellence. In The honor of excellence. Proceedings of the Burger King & NASSP Symposium for Outstanding Teachers and Principals (pp. 63-66). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Finn, C. E. (1985b). Teacher unions and school quality: Potential allies or inevitable foes? In J.H. Bunzel (Ed.), The challenge for American schools: The case for standards and values (pp. 99-124). New York: Oxford Univerisity Press.

Finn, C. E. (1986a). A fresh option for the non-college bound. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 234-238.

Finn, C. E. (1986b). We can shape our destiny. Educational Leadership, 44(1), 4-6.

Forcese, D.P., & Richer, S. (1973). Social research methods. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Foshay, A. W. (Ed.). (1980). Considered action for curriculum improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fox, D.J. (1969). The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed (Myra Ramos translation). New York: Continuum.

Gallup, G.H. (1982). The 14th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes towards the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 37-50.

Gardner D.P. (1976). The individual and society. In S.M. McMurrin (Ed.), On the meaning of the university: Essays on the occasion of the inauguration of David P. Gardner as 10th president of the University of Utah, November 19, 1973 (pp. 51-62). Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press.

Gardner, G.H. (1979). Preface. In W.T. Furniss, & D. Gardner (Eds.), Higher education and government: An uneasy alliance. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Gardner, D.P. (1984). Fulfilling our expectations. American Education, 20(2), 8-19, 22.

Gay, G. (1980). Conceptual Models of the curriculum-planning process. In A.W. Foshay (Ed.), Considered Action for Curriculum Improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

George, A.L. (1979). Case studies and theory development: The method of structured, focused comparison. In P. G. Lauren (Ed.), Diplomacy: New approaches in history, theory and policy (pp. 43-68). New York: The Free Press.

Geske, T., & Hoke, G. (1985). The national commission reports: Do the states have the fiscal capacity to respond? Education and Urban Society, 17(2), 171-185.

Giamatti, A.B. (1966). The earthly paradise and the Renaissance epic. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Giamatti, A.B.(Ed.). (1983). Dante in America: The first two centuries. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies.

Ginsberg, R., & Wimpelberg, R. K. (Eds.). (1985). The national reform reports (Special issue). Education and Urban Society, 17(2).

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine.

Goldberg, M., & Harvey J. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 14-18.

Good, C. (1962). Introduction to educational research: Methodology of design in the behavioral and social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Good, C., Barr, A., & Scates, D. (1941). The methodology of educational research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Good, H.G. (1970). A history of American education (2nd. ed.). Toronto: Macmillan Co.

Goode, W.J.,& Hatt, P.K. (1952). Methods in social research. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodman, K.S. (1984, January). A critique of the NCEE report. Education Digest, pp. 6-9.

Gordon, S.C. (1968). Reports and repercussions in West Indian Education, 1835-1933. London: Ginn.

Gordon, S.C. (1983a). Caribbean generations: A CXC history source book. New York: The Longman Group.

Gordon, S.C. (1983b). A Nation at Risk: Community colleges to the rescue. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(1), 14-15.

Gottschalk, L. (1969). Understanding history: A primer of historical method (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred Knopf.

Graham, P. A. (1984). Schools: Cacophony about practice, silence about purpose. Daedalus, 113(4), pp.29-57.

Graham, R. (1984). Governors must make education a priority. American Education, 20(2), 20-21.

Graubard, S.R., & Holton G. (Eds.). (1962). Excellence and leadership in a democracy. New York: Columbia University Press.

Graves, F.P. (1970). A student´s history of education: Our education today in light of its development (Greenwood Reprinting). New York: Macmillan.

Gross, B., & Gross, R. (Eds.). (1985). The great school debate. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hacker, Andrew. (1984, December). Have the schools flunked out? Education Digest, pp. 2-6.

Hall, G.S. (1905). Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion and education (Vol.II, pp.508-515). In S. Cohen (Ed.), (1974). Education in the United States: A documentary history (Vol. 3, pp.1946-1951). New York: Random House.

Handlin, O. (1971). John Dewey´s challenge to education: Historical perspectives on the cultural context. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Harris, W. T. (1884). Moral education in the common schools. In S. Cohen (Ed.), (1974). Education in the United States: A documentary history (Vol.3, pp. 1909-1914). New York: Random House.

Harris, W. T. (1885). Educational needs of urban civilization. Education, 5(5), 443-453.

Harris, W. T. (1888). Excessive helps in education. Education, 9(4), 215-220.

Harris, W.T. (1891). Vocation versus culture: Or the two aspects of education. Education, 12(4), 193-206.

Harris, W. T. (1894). The curriculum for secondary schools. Education, 14(10), 579-592.

Harris, W. T. (1969a). Psychologic foundations of education (rev. ed.). New York: Arno Press.

Harris, W. T. (1969b). Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education (reprint). New York: Arno Press.

Hawkins, R.B. (1985). A Strategy for revitalizing public school education. In J.H. Bunzel (Ed.), The challenge to American schools: The case for standards and values (pp. 29-46). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hawley, W.D. (1985). False premises, false promises: The mythical character of public discourse about education. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 183-7.

Hogan, D. (1978). Education and the making of the Chicago working class, 1880-1930. History of Education Quarterly, 18, 227- 270.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Holton, G. (Ed.).(1970). The twentieth-century sciences: Studies in the biographies of ideas. New York: W. W. Norton.

Holton, G. (1978a). The scientific imagination: Case studies. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Holton, G. (1978b). From the endless frontier to the ideology of limits. In G. Holton and R. Morrison (Eds.), Limits of scientific inquiry. New York: W.W. Norton.

Holton, G. (1984). A Nation At Risk revisited. Daedalus,113(4), 1-27.

Holton, G., & Elkana Y. (Eds.). (1982). Albert Einstein: Historical and cultural perspectives. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Honig, B. (1985). The educational excellence movement: now comes the hard part. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 675-681.

Howe, H. (1983). Education moves to center stage: An overview of recent studies. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 167-172.

Howe, H. (1984). More-of-the-same reform will not achieve both excellence and equity. Education Week, 3(35), 19, 24.

Hunkins, F. (1976). Building curriculum: Influences and mechanisms. In O. L. Davis (Ed.), Perspectives on curriculum development 1776-1976 (pp. 83-129). Washington, DC: American Society for Curriculum Development.

Hunt, J. B. (1984). Education for economic growth: A critical investment. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 538-541.

Hyde, E., Perlman, I., & Seaborg, G.T. (1971). The nuclear properties of the elements (2 Vols.). New York: Dover Publications.

Itzkoff, S. W. (1969). Cultural pluralism and the American education. Scranton, PA: International Textbook.

James T., & Tyack, D. (1983). Learning from past efforts to reform the high school. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 400-406.

Kamin, L. (1974). The science and politics of IQ. New York: Halsted Press.

Kandel, I. L. (Ed.). (1924). Twenty-Five years of American education: Collected essays. New York: Macmillan.

Kantor, H. (1982). Vocationalism in American education: The economic and political context, 1880 - 1930. In H. Kantor & D.B. Tyack (Eds.), Work, youth and schooling: Historical perspectives on vocationalism in American education (pp.14-44). Stanford, CT: Stanford University Press.

Karier, C. J., Spring, J., & Violas, P.C. (Eds.). (1973). Roots of crises: American education in the 20th Century. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Katz, J., Seaborg, G.T., & Morss R.L. (1986). The chemistry of the Actinide elements (2nd ed., 2 vol.). London: Chapman & Hall.

Katz, M. B. (1971). Class bureaucracy and the schools. New York: Praeger.

Kennedy, M. M. (1979). Generalizing from single case studies. Evaluation Quarterly, 3, 661-678.

Kliebard, R. (1975). Reappraisal: The Tyler rationale. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing (pp.70-83). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Knight, E. W. (1951). Education in the United States (3rd. ed.). New York: Greenwood Press.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Krug, E. (1964a). Salient dates in American education: 1635-1964. New York: Harper & Row.

Krug, E. (1964b). Shaping of the American high school. New York: Harper & Row.

Krug, E. (1965). Charles W. Eliot and popular education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Lauderdale, W.B. (1987). Educational reform: The forgotten half. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation. (Fastback #252).

Leenders, M. R., & Erskine, J.A. (1973). Case research: The case writing process. London, Canada: School of Bureaucratic Administration, The University of Western Ontario.

Leonard, G. (1984). The great school reform hoax. Esquire, 101(4), 47-56.

Lewis, A.C. (1984). A nation at risk: One year later. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 515-517.

Lundeen, R., Selby, R., Simmons, A., Wood, R., & Gardner, D. (1984). National reports on education: A round table discussion. American Education, 20(2), 38-45.

Mackenzie, J. (1894). The report of the Committee of Ten. School Review, 2, 146-155.

Marsh, P., & Campbell, A. (1982). Aggression and violence. New York: St. Martins Press.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. (1985). Survey of the American teacher 1985: Strengthening the profession. New York: Louis Harris & Assoc.

Meyer, A.E. (1967). An educational history of the American people (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miel, A. (1968). Reassessment of the curriculum--Why? In E.C. Short & G. D. Marconnit (Eds.), Contemporary thought on public school curriculum (pp. 153-159). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Miles, M. B., (Ed.). (1964). Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Mollison, A. (1984, December 8). Florida leads in school reforms. Miami News, pp. 1A, 4A.

Mulhern, J. (1959). A history of education: A social interpretation (2nd ed.). New York: Ronald Press.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends: Ten new directions transforming our lives. New York: Warner Books.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform (Stock No.065-000- 00177-2). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

National Education Association. (1969). Report of the committee on secondary school studies (rev. ed.). New York: Arno Press & The New York Times. (Original work published 1892)

National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology. (1983). Educating Americans for the 21st century. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Neilson, W. A. (1926). Charles W. Eliot, The man and his beliefs. New York: Harper & Bros.

Newsnotes. (1983). Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 229-230.

Odden, A. (1984). Financing educational excellence. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 311-318.

Odden, A. (1986). Sources of funding for education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 335-340.

Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Passow, H. (1984). Tackling the reform reports of the 1980´s. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 674-683.

Perkinson, H. (1977). The imperfect panacea: American faith in education 1865-1976 (2nd. ed.). New York: Random House.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R.H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America´s best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Peterson, P. E. (1983). Did the education commissions say anything? Education and Urban Society, 17(2), 126-144.

Phi Delta Kappa. (1983). The reports: Challenge and opportunity. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation

Pipho, C. (1983). States put `excellence´ into orbit. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 5-6.

Pipho, C. (1984a). States warm to excellence movement. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 516-517.

Pipho, C. (1984b). A year of transition for education. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 661-662.

Pipho, C. (1985a). The excellence movement: On ice for the summer? Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 669-670.

Pipho, C. (1985b). Education reform continues to command attention. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 101, 175.

Pipho, C. (1986a). Education reform: It looks like a keeper. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 701-702.

Pipho, C. (1986b). A bumper crop of education activity. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 5-6.

Pipho, C. (1986c). States move reform closer to reality. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, K1-K8.

Presseisen, B.Z. (1986). Unlearned lessons: Current and past reforms for school improvement. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Raise and omnibus clarification/vocation education/teacher recruitment bill, CSSB148, Ch.85-109. (1985). Tallahassee: State of Florida, Department of Education.

Ravitch, D. (1983). Forgetting the questions: The problem of educational reform. Independent School, 42(3), 57-67.

Ravitch, D. (1984). The continuing crisis: Fashions in education. The American Scholar, 53, 183-193.

Ravitch, D. (1985). Schools we deserve: Reflections on the educational crises of our time. New York: Basic Books.

Reagan, R. (1984). Excellence and opportunity: A program of support for American education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 13-15.

Reitzel J., & Lindemann, B. (1982). Historical evidence. In R. Smith and P. Manning (Eds.), A handbook of social science methods (Vol.2, pp. 167-196). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Resnick, D.P., & Resnick, L.B. (1985). Standards, curriculum, and performance: A historical and comparative perspective. Educational Researcher, 14(4), 5-20.

Robinson, O. (1894, December). The work of the Committee of Ten. The School Review, 2, 366-375.

Roth, J.K. (1984, December). Excellence in education and the NCEE report. Education Digest, pp. 10-13.

Sarason, S.B. (1983). Schooling in America: Scapegoat and salvation. New York: The Free Press.

Saylor, J.G., Alexander, W.M., & Lewis, A.J. (1981). Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Schurman, J.G. (1894). The report on secondary school studies. School Review, 2, 83-97.

Seaborg, G.T. (1963). Man-made Transuranium elements. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Seaborg, G.T. (1981). Kennedy, Kruschev and the test ban. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Seaborg, G.T., & Corliss, W. (1971). Man and atom: Building a new world through nuclear technology. New York: E.P. Dutton.

Sedlak, M., Wheeler, C., Pullin, D., & Cusick, P. (1985). High school reform and the "bargain" to learn. Education and Urban Society, 17(2), 215-222.

Senese, D.J. (1985). Capturing the spirit of educational quality. The Principal, 31 (1), 1-7.

Shafer, R. J. (1980). A guide to historical method (3rd ed.). Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.

Shanker, A. (1984a, October 21). Reforms won't yield quick results: Education improvements take political courage. The New York Times, Sec.4, p.3.

Shanker, A. (1984b). Taking the measure of American education reform: An assessment of the education reports. American Journal of Education, 92(3), 314-324.

Shanker, A. (1985). The reform reports: Reaction from the front lines. Education and Urban Society, 17, 119-125.

Shimahara, N.K. (1985). Japanese education and the implications for U.S. education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 418-421.

Shofner, J. (1974). Nor is it over yet: Florida in the era of Reconstruction. Gainesville, FL: University Presses of Florida, University of Florida.

Sizer, T.R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Spock, B. (1984). Coercion in the classroom will not work. The Atlantic, 253 (4), 28-36.

Spring, J. (1972). Education and the rise of the corporate state. Boston: Beacon Press.

Spring, J. (1973). Education as a form of social control. In C. J. Karier, J. Spring, & P. C. Violas (Eds.), Roots of crises: American education in the twentieth century (pp.30-39). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Spring, J. (1984). Education and the Sony war. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 534-537.

Spring, J. (1986). The American school 1642-1985: Varieties of historical interpretation of the foundations and development of American education. New York: Longman.

Stedman, L., & Kaestle, C. (1985). The test score decline is over: Now what? Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 204-210.

Stedman, L.C., & Smith, M.S. (1983). Recent reform proposals for American education. Contemporary Education Review, 2, 85-104.

Stephens, J.M. (1967). The process of schooling. New York: Holt & Rinehart.

Symposium on the year of the reports: Responses from the educational community. (1984). Harvard Education Review, 54(1), 1-31.

Taylor, J.M. (1894). The report of the Committee of Ten. School Review, 2, 193-199.

Thayer, V.T. (1974). Formative ideas in American education: From the colonial period to the present. New York: Dodd-Mead.

Timpane, M. (1984). Business has rediscovered the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 389-392.

Toch, T. (1984). For school reform's top salesmen. It's been some year. Education Week, 3(37-8), 1, 33.

Toffler, A. (1980). The third wave. New York: William Morrow.

Trow, M. (1985). Underprepared students and public research universities. In J.W. Bunzel (Ed.), The challenge to American schools: The case for standards and values (pp. 191-215). New York: Oxford University Press.

Turlington, R. (1985). Getting ready for 1989 (LL-24C). Tallahassee: State of Florida, Public Information and Cabinet Affairs Office.

Turlington, R. (1986). Reaching for Excellence: The 1986 annual report of the Commissioner of Education. Tallahassee, State of Florida: Department of Education.

Twentieth Century Fund, Task Force on Federal, Elementary and Secondary School Policy. (1983). Making the grade: Report of the twentieth century fund task force on federal elementary and secondary education policy. New York: The Fund.

23% boom makes Florida fourth most populace state. (1987, December 30). Miami Herald, p.A1.

Tyack, D. B., (Ed.). (1967). Turning points in American educational history. Lexington, MA: Xerox.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). The one best system. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tye, B.B. (1984). Unfamiliar waters: Let's stop talking and jump in. Educational Leadership. 41, 27-31.

Tye, K.A., & Tye, B. (1984). Teacher isolation and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 319-322.

Tyler, R.W. (1982). The U.S. vs. the world: A comparison of educational performance. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 307-310.

Tyler, R.W. (1987). Education reforms. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 277-280.

United States Department of Education. (1984). The nation responds: Recent efforts to improve education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Van Dalen, D.B. (1962). Understanding educational research: An introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Walberg, H. (1986). What works in a nation still at risk. Educational Leadership, 44(1), 7-10.

Walker, D., & Schaffarzick, J. Comparing curricula. Review of Educational Research, 44(1), 83-111.

Webster's New 20th century dictionary (2nd ed.). (1975). London: Collins World.

Welsh, P. (1986). What reform? Educational Leadership, 44(1), 56-60.

Welter, R. (1971). American writings on popular education: The nineteenth century. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

West, A. M. (1980). The educational association: The power base for education. New York: The Free Press.

Wiersma, W. (1969). Research methods in education: An introduction. New York: J. B. Lippencott.

Williamson, E. (1976). Florida politics in the gilded age. Gainesville, FL: University Presses of Florida, University of Florida.

Wimpelberg, R., & Ginsberg, R. (1985). Are school districts responding to A nation at risk? Education and Urban Society, 17(2), 186-203.

Winn, I. (1983). High school reform: Stuffing the turkeys. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 184-185.

Woodring, P. (1983). The persistent problems of education. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Yeakey, C., & Johnston, G. (1985). High school reform: A critique and a broader construct of social reality. Education and Urban Society, 17(2), 157-170.

Yin, R. K. (1981a). The case study as a serious research strategy. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 3, (2), 97-114.

Yin, R.K. (1981b). The case study crises: Some answers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 58-65.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R.K., Bateman, P.G., & Moore, G.B. (1983). Case studies and organizational innovation: Strengthening the connection. Washington, DC: Cosmos.

Yudof, M. G. (1984). Educational policy research and the new concensus of the 1980's. Phi Delta Kappan, 65,456-459.

Zirbes, L. (1968). Curriculum trends. In E.C. Short & G.D. Marconnit (Eds.), Contemporary thought on public school curriculum (p.155). Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown. (Original work published in 1935).

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Rhea Zirkes Schwartzberg was born in New York City on October 6, 1954 to Evelyn and Meyer Zirkes. She attended Ramaz School in Manhattan through the 12th grade.

In 1976 Rhea received her Bachelor of Arts degree, magna cum laude, from Barnard College where she majored in psychology and minored in education and a Bachelor of Hebrew Literature from the Jewish Theological Seminary. In the same year she married Leo Schwartzberg and moved to Miami. Rhea completed her Master of Science in educational administration and supervision at Florida International University in 1979.

Rhea taught in Dade and Broward county private schools for 7 years and served as executive director of a computer school for 2 years, before becoming Education Director at Beth Torah Congregation in 1985. She has also taught as an adjunct professor at Miami Dade Community College and FIU.

Rhea, her husband Leo, and their three children, Hanan, Dina, and Shira reside in North Miami Beach. Extremely active in community affairs, Rhea is currently PTA president of the Samuel Scheck Hillel Community Day School where she

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Paul S. George, Chairman
Professor of Educational
Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Gordon D. Lawrence
Professor of Educational
Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Stephen M. Fain
Professor of Educational
Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Forrest W. Parkay
Associate Professor of
Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Arthur O. White
Professor of Foundations
of Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

April 1988

Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School